DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 029 584 HE 000 754

Higher Education Appropriation Recommendations for Current Operations 1969-1971.
Ohio Board of Regents, Columbus.
Pub Date 10 Jan 69
Note-52p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.70
Descriptors-•Educational Finance, Enrollment Projections, •Expenditures, •Higher Education, •State Aid, •State Colleges, Student Loan Programs
Identifiers-•Ohio

The document contains the recommendations of the Ohio Board of Regents for state support of current operations of state-assisted institutions of higher education, and support of a new program of instructional grants to Ohio students enrolled in the state's accredited colleges and universities. The expenditure requirements cover the period from July 1, 1969 to June 30, 1971, and include an increase in the state subsidy, student fees, and other income for instructional activities. The recommended direct instructional grant assistance for students of limited financial resources who enroll on a full-time basis as undergraduates in accredited public and private institutions will require legislative authorization. Different amounts of research funds are suggested to support existing research activities at universities or at separate research centers or corporations, regent's professorships, and 2 proposed research centers. A comprehensive effort in public service is recommended which would include support of the existing agricultural extension service for farm families, and hospital operations in connection with medical education. The Board would add additional teacher institutions, corrections and law enforcement education, and home study, teacher education, educational television, plus supplementary instruction to high school graduates to prepare them for college. (WM)

ED029584

HIGHER EDUCATION

APPROPRIATION RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CURRENT OPERATIONS 1969 - 1971

OHIO BOARD OF REGENTS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE 000 754

HIGHER EDUCATION
APPROPRIATION RECOMMENDATIONS
FOR CURRENT OPERATIONS
1969 – 1971

OHIO BOARD OF REGENTS

January 10, 1969

OHIO BOARD OF REGENTS

John Marshall Briley, Chairman

Robert F. Doolittle, Vice-Chairman

Maceo R. Clark, M.D., Secretary

MEMBERS

Terms Expiring September 20, 1969

Robert F. Doolittle Paul E. Belcher William H. Zimmer

Terms Expiring September 20, 1972

George J. Tankersley Edward E. Davis

Terms Expiring September 20, 1975

John Marshall Briley Maceo R. Clarke, M. D. Robert Lazarus, Sr.

Staff

John D. Millett
Chancellor

James M. Furman
Executive Officer

William B. Coulter
Program Officer

Daniel P. D'Oliveira
Campus Planning Officer

Robert O. Lehnert
Budget Analyst

Duane R. Rogers
Systems Officer

Roger E. Walls
Fiscal and
Facilities Analyst

Henry L. Whitcomb
Finance Officer

CONTENTS

Page

PREFACE iv

CHAPTER 1 Instruction 1

CHAPTER 2 Student Aid 18

CHAPTER 3 Research 23

CHAPTER 4 Public Service 27

CHAPTER 5 Administration 34

CHAPTER 6 Summary 35

APPENDIX 37

PREFACE

This document presents the recommendations of the Ohio Board of Regents for the appropriation support of the current operations of state-assisted institutions of higher education, together with support of a new program of instructional grants to Ohio students enrolled in accredited colleges and universities in Ohio, in the biennium beginning July 1, 1969, and ending June 30, 1971.

The expenditure requirements of the various state-assisted institutions have been determined in accordance with a planning-programming-budgeting system with emphasis upon the end purposes or objectives to be accomplished from the expenditure of these funds. The program basis of these expenditure requirements is explained in detail in the document.

The expenditure requirements for 1969-71 focus attention upon four different functions of state-assisted institutions of higher education:

1. Instruction
2. Student Aid
3. Research
4. Public Service

The function of auxiliary services at state-assisted institutions of higher education does not receive any financial support from state government. This group of activities on various campuses – student health service, student residence and dining halls, student cultural services, student recreational and social services, student publications, student government, and intercollegiate athletics – is supported by charges (room rents, food service bills, ticket sales), supplemented by receipts from a general fee paid by students.

Income for the various functions of state-assisted institutions of higher education may be derived from a variety of sources. Income for instruction is obtained primarily from state appropriations and student fee charges. Income for student aid is obtained primarily from the federal government and from private gifts. Income for research is obtained primarily from the federal government, although such income was substantially reduced in 1968-69 and will probably not increase in 1969-70. Income for public service is obtained from state appropriations and from charges, with some assistance from the federal government.

The recommendations contained herein represent the expenditure requirements for these four functions to be met from state appropriations.

There are parts of the budget program presented herein which will need legislative authorization in order to undertake the recommended expenditure. This is the case with the proposed addition of legal education to the mission of Cleveland State University, and with the proposed inauguration of a student instructional grant program. Other innovative endeavors as identified herein can be undertaken with the provision of the recommended appropriations. The entire set of appropriation recommendations constitutes a comprehensive state government effort in the field of higher education.

It is understood that income available to the Ohio General Fund under existing taxation will not be sufficient in 1969-1971 to meet the expenditure requirements of these recommendations. In order to provide the appropriations set forth here, the public of Ohio as represented in the Ohio General Assembly will have to be persuaded to make additional income available to higher education because of the essential services rendered to all the citizens of Ohio.

John D. Millett
Chancellor

SUMMARY OF APPROPRIATION RECOMMENDATIONS

	1967-68 Actual	1968-69 Actual	1969-70 Recommended	1970-71 Recommended
Instruction				
Subsidies per student	$130,866,305	$158,398,100	$190,385,775	$201,896,400
Less Subsidies to out-of-state students	---	---	3,285,775	6,934,400
			$187,100,000	$194,962,000
Other Subsidies	3,521,425	3,703,250	4,660,000	4,800,000
Celina Branch	---	---	139,500	175,500
Cleveland Law	---	---	846,000	900,000
			$ 5,645,500	5,875,500
	$134,387,730	$162,101,350	$192,745,500	$200,837,500
Student Aid				
Instructional Grants	---	---	$ 12,525,000	$ 12,870,000
War Orphans Scholarships	---	---	90,000	90,000
High Risk Loan Guarantees	---	---	90,000	105,000
			$ 12,705,000	$13,065,000
Research				
Agri. Res. & Dev.	$ 3,962,226	$ 3,950,000	$ 4,358,000	$ 4,576,000
Medical Research	1,780,000	1,812,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
University Research	1,400,000	1,500,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
Research Centers	---	---	500,000	500,000
Regents' Professors	275,000	190,000	350,000	350,000
	$ 7,417,226	$ 7,452,000	$ 10,208,000	$ 10,426,000
Public Service				
State Tech. Serv.	$ 100,000	$ 129,781	$ 200,000	$ 200,000
Univ. Hospitals	4,270,000	4,538,000	4,968,000	5,300,000
T.B. Hospital	(1,686,000)	(1,686,000)	(1,166,723)	(1,236,803)
Agri. Extension	2,150,000	2,150,000	2,415,000	2,536,000
Teacher Institutes	---	---	600,000	600,000
Corrections Educa.	---	---	240,000	240,000
Law Enforcement Ed.	---	---	450,000	450,000
Labor Educa. Service	---	---	100,000	100,000
College Study Improvem.	---	---	600,000	600,000
Home Study Development	---	---	250,000	250,000
Teacher Educa. Study	---	---	320,000	180,000
Educa. T.V.-Operating	---	---	500,000	500,000
Educa. T.V.-Facilities	---	---	4,000,000	---
	$ 6,520,000	$ 6,817,781	$ 14,643,000	$ 10,956,000
Administration				
Ohio Board of Regents	$ 272,043	$ 355,500	$ 350,000	$ 356,000
TOTAL	$148,596,999	$176,726,631	$230,651,500	$235,640,500

SUMMARY OF APPROPRIATION REQUESTS

	1967-68 Actual	1968-69 Actual	1969-70 Requested	1970-71 Requested
Instruction				
Subsidies Per Student	$130,866,305	$158,398,100	$228,698,335	$259,069,130
Less Subsidies to Out-of-State Students	---	---	---	---
Other Subsidies	3,521,425	3,703,250	4,674,420	6,382,175
Celina Branch	---	---	108,500	108,500
Cleveland Law	---	---	705,000	750,000
	$134,387,730	$162,101,350	$234,186,255	$266,309,805
Student Aid				
Instructional Grants	---	---	---	---
Research				
Agric. Res. & Dev.	$ 3,962,226	$ 3,950,000	$ 6,729,668	$ 7,414,184
Medical Research	1,780,000	1,812,000	2,750,000	2,750,000
University Research	1,400,000	1,500,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
Regents' Professors	275,000	190,000	350,000	350,000
	7,417,226	7,452,000	24,829,668	25,514,184
Public Service				
State Technical Serv.	$ 100,000	$ 129,781	$ 200,000	$ 200,000
University Hospitals	4,270,000	4,538,000	5,000,000	5,300,000
TB Hospital	(1,686,000)	(1,686,000)	(1,400,000)	(1,400,000)
Agric. Extension	2,150,000	2,150,000	3,085,028	3,327,782
Teacher Institutes	---	---	1,500,000	1,500,000
Corrections Education	---	---	300,000	300,000
Law Enforcement Educa.	---	---	1,000,000	1,000,000
Home Study Dev.	---	---	---	---
Disadvantaged Students	---	---	3,500,000	3,500,000
Teacher Education Study	---	---	---	---
Educational T.V.	---	---	1,000,000	1,000,000
	$ 6,520,000	$ 6,817,781	15,585,028	$ 16,127,782
Administration				
Ohio Board of Regents	$ 272,043	$ 355,500	$ 350,000	$ 356,000
TOTAL	$148,596,999	$176,726,631	$274,950,951	$308,307,771

CHAPTER 1 INSTRUCTION

The appropriation to state-assisted institutions for instruction of students is based upon a formula. The formula consists of two parts: the number of students and a support factor per student. The product of these two items expresses the amount of money to be provided for instructional purposes.

A good deal of discussion might be devoted to the whole subject of the formula basis for providing instructional funds to colleges and universities. In opposition to the formula it is argued that it reduces institutions to a common basis of operation and does not permit the development of special strengths; it is also argued that a formula is too mechanistic for so dynamic and individualized an endeavor as higher education. On the other hand, a formula has certain definite advantages. It eliminates the possibility of favoritism in the financing of one institution as against another institution. It provides a definite base or foundation upon which instructional endeavors can be built. And the formula can provide differential levels of support based upon different levels of instruction.

In any event, the Ohio Board of Regents continuously since 1964 has sought to develop higher education appropriations for instructional purposes upon a formula basis. The recommendations for 1969-71 again reflect the use of a formula.

It should be pointed out that the formula procedure embodies the essence of a planning-programming-budget system. The determination of enrollment forecasts by levels of instruction is a reflection of planning decisions about enrollment demand, enrollment capacity, and enrollment distribution by types of state-assisted institutions. The construction of standardized budget needs by types or levels of instruction represents both programming of activity and the analysis of needed resources to carry out such activity. The result is to place higher education budgeting upon a solid base of information rather than of guess-work.

Enrollment

Table 1 presents the actual full-time equivalent student enrollment which the state appropriation supported in the current biennium 1967-1969. It also presents the projections of enrollment estimates predicted for the biennium 1969-1971.

This enrollment experience and these enrollment projections are divided into eight different categories. These categories in turn indicate various kinds of instructional programs offered by Ohio's state-assisted institutions of higher education. The definition of these programs and levels of instruction are as follows:

Academic Centers: designated places where lower division instruction in the arts and sciences, and professional preparation courses are offered in a high school facility on a late afternoon and evening basis, usually 4 nights a week (4:00 P.M., to 9:00 P.M.).

Lower Division: instruction in arts and sciences and professional preparation courses (business administration and teacher education primarily) offered to students in the first two years of undergraduate programs.

Technical Education: instruction in courses specifically designed to prepare young people for careers in engineering technologies, business technologies, health technologies, education technologies, and government technologies.

Upper-Division and Baccalaureate Professional: instruction at the specialized (junior and senior year) level in arts and sciences and all undergraduate specialized professional courses in the fields of agriculture, architecture, art, engineering, home economics, journalism, library science, music, nursing, social work, and allied medical professions.

Master's Degree: instruction of graduate students for a master of arts or a master of science degree in the arts, sciences, and professional fields of study.

Graduate Professional: instruction of graduate or specialized students in the professional fields of law, dentistry, and pharmacy.

Doctor's Degree: instruction of students beyond the master's degree level for the degree Doctor of Philosophy or other doctoral degree in the arts, sciences, and professional fields of study.

Medicine: instruction of graduate students or specialized students to qualify for the degrees Doctor of Medicine, Doctor of Veterinary Medicine, and Doctor of Optometry.

TABLE 1

Full–Time Equivalent Student Enrollment
By Levels and Programs of Instruction
1967 – 1971

	1967-68 Actual	1968-69 Actual	1969-70 Projected	1970-71 Projected
Academic Centers	2,658	2,952	3,500	4,000
Lower Division	108,477	111,410	120,430	129,350
Technical	1,210	2,473	5,940	7,020
Upper Div. - Bacc. Prof.	56,924	69,529	74,505	78,830
Master's Degree	8,797	9,777	11,050	12,125
Graduate Professional	2,465	2,525	2,650	2,775
Doctor's Degree	3,619	5,292	5,925	5,925
Medicine	1,617	1,679	1,710	1,710
	185,767	205,637	225,710	241,735

In this listing of eight primary categories of levels and types of instruction, one new category has been added to the budget presentation made in 1967. This new category is that of technical education. The omission of such a separate category of instruction in the current biennium 1967-1969 was a mistake. Experience has clearly demonstrated that technical education is a kind of program which deserves special attention and emphasis, and that such instruction involves elements of expenditure which cannot be equated with lower division instruction in general.

The full-time equivalent student enrollment in 1967-68 of 185,767 students represented an increase of 24 percent above the enrollment subsidized in 1966-67. The Board of Regents had forecast a full-time equivalent enrollment of 183,000 students for 1967-68; thus the actual experience exceeded forecasts by about 2,000 students. For 1968-69 the Board estimated a total enrollment of 205,690 students and the actual enrollment was 205,637–a difference of just 53 students. On the other hand, there were considerable variations in the estimated and actual composition of full-time equivalent enrollment. The Board over-estimated lower division enrollments, under-estimated upper division enrollments, and under-estimated doctoral degree enrollments.

Enrollments are expected to advance again in 1969-1971 but some what more slowly than in recent years. Full-time equivalent enrollment will be about 9.7 percent greater in 1969-70 than in 1968-69, and another 6.6 percent in 1970-71 over 1969-70.

A major problem in determining future enrollments is to forecast prospective full-time equivalent students at the master's degree and doctor's degree levels. Such enrollment responds to various circumstances: the draft, the financial incentives of school districts and business employers which encourage personnel to enroll for advanced degrees on a part-time basis, and the recruitment activity of graduate departments and schools. The Board believes that the master's and doctoral degree enrollment projections for 1969-1971 must be considered not simply as forecasts but also as ceilings.

Full-time equivalent enrollments are determined upon the basis of course enrollments to fulfill degree requirements. The rules of the Board of Regents do not include "auditors" of courses or other special students who are not matriculated as a degree candidate. Full-time equivalent enrollment is calculated by enumerating all credit hours of course enrollments by degree students and then by dividing these credit hours by 15–the number of credit hours fixed to represent a full-time student. Moreover, the full-time equivalent enrollment represents a year-round enrollment; that is, full-time equivalent enrollment in the autumn quarter *plus* the full-time equivalent enrollment of the summer quarter (credit hours of course enrollment divided by 45). Academic tradition and practice recognize the three quarters of autumn, winter, and spring as the normal academic year. Faculty contracts are ordinarily made for three quarters. The summer quarter represents an additional period of instruction for those who wish to speed up their progress toward a degree, or for those not able to enroll in some other quarter.

Head-Count Enrollments

The budget program of the Ohio Board of Regents utilizes the concept of full-time equivalent students determined through credit hours of course enrollment because this is a measure, the only satisfactory measure, of instructional output. Many reports about higher education enrollment, however, are based upon head counts, the enumeration of all the individual persons who are enrolled in institutions of higher education regardless of the number of courses or the number of credit hours for which they are enrolled. Sometimes these enrollment reports do indicate a distinction between full-time and part-time students, with an arbitrary dividing line such as 12 credit hours marking the distinction between full-time and part-time.

Moreover, enrollment reports based upon head counts are ordinarily taken at one particular point in time, such as October 1 or October 10 in the autumn of an academic year. It is customary to make head counts at this particular time because the autumn, as we have said, represents the peak enrollment of the year. Enrollments in the winter, spring, and summer quarters are ordinarily less than the enrollment in the autumn quarter.

Because so many persons are familiar with the autumn head count enrollments, we are including here in Table 2 the enrollment in state-assisted institutions of higher education by level of instruction as of the autumns of 1967 and 1968, with the projections for the autumns of 1969 and 1970. It will be noted that the head-count enrollment for the autumn of 1968 exceeds the full-time equivalent enrollment for the summer quarter of 1968 plus the full-time equivalent enrollment for the autumn of 1968 by approximately 35,000: some 241,000 to just under 206,000.

TABLE 2

Head–Count Enrollments
Ohio State–Assisted Institutions of Higher Education
Autumn Quarter
1967–1970

	1967 Actual	1968 Actual	1969 Estimated	1970 Estimated
Academic Centers	5,560	6,025	7,000	8,000
Lower Division*	126,005	133,160	142,700	150,300
Technical**	14,100	17,700	21,300	25,200
Upper Division	51,148	55,200	60,600	65,000
Master's	14,963	16,405	18,800	20,600
Graduate-Professional	3,639	3,895	4,050	4,350
Doctor's	4,871	7,144	8,000	8,000
Medical	1,450	1,504	1,550	1,550
	221,736	241,033	264,000	283,000

*Lower division enrollments on a head-count basis include sophomore students in baccalaureate professional courses.

**Does not include non-degree credit adult education supported by student fees and institutional resources.

Resource Analysis

A major objective of the Ohio Board of Regents since its establishment in 1963 has been to develop an effective means for analyzing the actual instructional expenditures of the state-assisted institutions. Indeed, efforts in this direction had been launched on a voluntary basis by the state-assisted universities in Ohio before 1963. The technique of the Board of Regents has been identified as "resource analysis" and is the output of the uniform information system set up by the Board in 1966.

In preparing appropriation recommendations for 1967-1969 the Board of Regents constructed "model" instructional budgets upon the basis of the expenditure data available at that time. In preparation of appropriation recommendations for 1969-1971 the Board has had the advantage of the first year of comprehensive resource analysis for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968. The Board has also had the benefit of recommendations from each state-assisted institution.

Table 3 summarizes the data on instructional expenditures studied by the staff of the Board of Regents. The first column shows the instructional expenditures per student set up by the Board for the second year of the current biennium, the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969. The second column shows the composite, or weighted average, expenditures per student resulting from the resource analysis procedure. The staff concludes that this information is useful but not necessarily completely reliable since this was the first year of such analysis. The third column indicates the range of expenditure requirements per student for levels and programs of instruction as estimated by the various state-assisted institutions of higher education.

In one important respect the resource analysis for 1967-68 was deficient. No effort was made to separate the instructional expenditures for technical education from the instructional expenditure for lower division instruction as a whole. Various indications from administrators make it clear that technical education instruction is more expensive to provide than other lower division instructional programs as a group. The requests from state-assisted institutions also reflect this experience.

After careful review, the expenditure pattern for instructional activity set forth in the fourth column was determined to be an equitable minimum standard to recommend for 1969-1971. It would require extensive discussion to explain the various considerations of fact and of judgment which have entered into this recommended expenditure proposal. Perhaps it is sufficient here to suggest only certain conclusions which were arrived at in the process of this consideration. First, it seemed evident that the Board in 1967-1969 had underestimated the instructional expenditures for lower division students. Secondly, as already stated, the Board had underestimated by a considerable margin the instructional expenditures for technical education. Thirdly, the Board had underestimated instructional expenditures for master's degree students. In the fourth place, the Board had in general overestimated instructional expenditures for doctoral degree students. If anything, the Board also overestimated instructional expenditures as a whole for upper division and baccalaureate-professional instruction.

TABLE 3

Instructional Expenditures Per Student
By Program and Level of Instruction

	Projected 1968-69	Weighted Average 1967-68	Institution Recommendations 1969-1971	Regents Recommendations 1969-1971
Academic Centers	$ 720	--	--	$ 870
Lower Division	820	$ 960	$ 820-1,150	960
Technical Education	820	--	1,275-1,575	1,260
Upper Division	1,490	1,420	1,700-2,200	1,605
Bacc.-Prof.	1,490	1,770	1,750-2,400	1,605
Master's	2,160	2,950	2,650-4,000	2,700
Grad.-Prof	2,160	3,000	3,000-4,000	2,700
Doctor's	5,520	4,000	5,250-6,700	4,650
Medicine	5,520	5,500	5,500-7,300	6,000

In arriving at a new pattern of instructional expenditures, the Board of Regents has kept in mind the factor of inflation upon current costs of operation, and has projected at least a 5 percent per year increase in salary levels. A part of the funds available in 1969-70 would be carried forward into 1970-71 in order to provide for higher salaries in the second year of the biennium.

One other comment is needed at this point. In preparing its appropriation recommendations for the current biennium 1967-1969, the Board of Regents did not stress adequately the importance of the *aggregate* expenditure requirements for instructional purposes. Because the General Assembly is asked to provide only a part of the total expenditures projected for instructional purposes, there is a tendency for some persons to concentrate attention only upon *tax* support rather than upon *total* support. It is hoped that in reviewing this document, equal attention will be given to both tax support and total support of the instructional activity of state-assisted institutions of higher education.

This matter is so important that it deserves restatement to give it appropriate emphasis. The budget procedure of the Ohio Board of Regents involves, in addition to enrollment estimates, a determination of *total* necessary expenditures per student for the instructional activity of state-assisted institutions. Necessarily, this determination is a composite of varied experience and does not represent the exact experience or expectation of any one institution. Necessarily, also, this determination sets forth a *minimum* standard of need in order to provide instructional service to students.

The recommended pattern of expenditures by levels and types of instructional programs are set forth in Appendix A to this document. This recommended pattern of expenditures includes the major fiscal accounting and reporting categories for the instructional and general operation of each institution. These data are presented in terms of the expenditure requirements for 1,000 full-time equivalent students enrolled for a three-quarter academic year. As will be discussed later, the Board of Regents has no authority, however, over the actual use made of the financial resources made available to each state-assisted institution of higher education.

The recommended pattern of instructional expenditures by program levels and program fields of instruction must be accompanied by a recommended pattern of income. In general, state-assisted institutions of higher education have two sources of income: instructional subsidies from the state and instructional charges to students. In the instance of community colleges, there may be local tax support as well, so that expenditures for instruction are divided between state, county government, and student. For the most part, however, state-assisted institutions insofar as their instructional and general operation are concerned must depend upon two sources of funding: the State of Ohio and the student. These two sources of funding respectively constitute the State Support Factor and the student Instructional Fee. In the absence of other available income, these two must add up to the minimum instructional expenditure requirements per student.

State Support Factors

When the expenditure requirements by level and type of instructional programs have been determined, then a decision must be made about the relative proportion of this cost to be provided by the State of Ohio and by the individual student (or other sources). As has already been pointed out, expenditure requirements are quite different, depending upon the basis of different levels of instruction and different fields of instruction. It is more costly to provide lower division instruction in technical education than in arts and sciences. It is more costly to provide instruction at the master's degree level or in law than at the upper division baccalaureate level. It is more costly to provide medical education than to provide education to Ph.D. degree students.

The recommended state support factors for instruction as against student instructional charges depend in large part upon a philosophy or tradition of state support for higher education. This will be discussed further below. But recommended state support factors also depend upon what the state can *afford* to spend for higher education instruction. This is obviously a political decision. It is a decision which must be made in the context of available state tax revenues, including the possibility of additional revenues from new tax meausre. This is a decision, furthermore, which must be made by the organs of political decision-making in state government: essentially the executive branch and the legislative branch of government.

The Ohio Board of Regents presents its budget recommendations "in cooperation with" the Department of Finance, which is the executive's arm in matters of fiscal policy and state governmental appropriations. As a result of this consultation and in accordance with the expenditure needs set forth in this document, the Board presents herewith its recommended state support factors for the biennium 1969-1971, compared with the the support factors for the current year of the present biennium 1967-1969.

These recommended support factors reflect the higher expenditure requirements for the biennium 1969-1971. The increase for lower division students in arts and sciences is an increase for 1969-70 of 28.5 percent over 1968-69. The increase for technical education is an increase of more than 100 percent. The increase for the upper division student and the student in baccalaureate professional courses is negligible. The increase for master's and graduate-professional students is an increase of 20 percent, but the support factor for doctoral degree students has been decreased by 22 percent. The increase in the support factor for medical students amounts to 6 percent.

These increases in state support factors are not sufficient to prevent an increase in student instructional charges as well. Additional student income will also be necessary in order to meet the expenditure requirements for the instructional programs of state-assisted institutions of higher education.

The state support factors recommended herein, along with increases in enrollment, will involve an increase of total state subsidy for instruction amounting to $32 million in 1969-70 over 1968-69, and another $11.5 million in 1970-71. These data are shown in Table 4.

	Actual Support Factors Per Student 1968-69	Recommended Support Factors Per Student 1969-1971
Academic Centers	$ 250	$ 360
Lower Division	350	450
Technical Education	350	750
Upper Div. - Bacc.-Prof.	1,000	1,005
Master's Degree	1,500	1,800
Graduate-Professional	1,500	1,800
Doctor's Degree	4,800	3,750
Medicine	4,800	5,100

TABLE 4

Appropriations Required By Recommended Support Factors

	1967-68 Actual	1968-69 Actual	1969-70 Recommended	1970-71 Recommended
Academic Centers	$ 645,742	$ 738,000	$ 1,260,000	$ 1,440,000
Lower Division	36,841,864	38,993,500	54,193,500	58,207,500
Technical Education	1,161,600	1,854,750	4,455,000	5,265,000
Upper Div.-Bac.-Prof.	54,647,040	67,213,525	74,877,525	79,224,150
Master's Degree	11,727,479	14,665,500	19,890,000	21,825,000
Graduate-Prof.	3,242,582	3,787,500	4,770,000	4,995,000
Doctor's Degree	16,011,273	23,086,125	22,218,750	22,218,750
Medicine	6,588,725	8,059,200	8,721,000	8,721,000
	$ 130,866,305	$ 158,398,100	$ 190,385,775	$ 201,896,400

It may be worthwhile to set forth here the subsidies per student which would have to be provided from tax funds *if* no increase in student fees and other income were to be necessary. If student instructional charges for Ohio residents were to remain at $150 per quarter, the subsidies per student would have to be fixed as follows:

	Support Factors Per Student 1968-69	Recommended Support Factors Per Student 1969-1971	Required Support Factors Per Student Without Fee Increase
Academic Centers	$ 250	$ 360	$ 420
Lower Division	350	450	510
Technical Education	350	750	810
Upper Div.-Bac.-Prof.	1,000	1,005	1,155
Master's Degree	1,500	1,800	2,250
Graduate-Prof.	1,500	1,800	2,250
Doctor's Degree	4,800	3,750	4,200
Medicine	4,800	5,100	5,550

In terms of total appropriations, the difference between recommended support factors and the support factors which would maintain current student instructional charges would be as follows:

	1969-70	1970-71
Recommended Subsidies	$190,385,775	$ 201,896,400
Larger Subsidies	281,954,475	232,283,850
	$ 28,568,700	$ 30,387,450

Instructional Fees

Ohio's state-assisted institutions of higher education levy three kinds of charges upon students other than room and board charges. These charges to students are: (1) an instructional fee; (2) a general (or services) fee; and (3) a tuition surcharge. *This third charge is paid only by the student who is a non-resident of Ohio.*

The general fee is utilized by a college or university to meet the expenses of a student health program, a cultural (performing arts) program, a recreational and social program, student publications program, an inter-collegiate athletic program, student government program, and part or all of the debt service for specialized facilities (social, recreational, athletic, convocation, and other facilities).

The instructional fee is utilized by a college or university as the additional income needed to balance instructional expenditures with instructional income. If a college or university has sources of income for instructional and general activity other than the state subsidy and student instructional charges, this additional income may be used to reduce the required level of student charges. Thus, a community college with county tax support may have a lower student instructional charge than a university branch or a university main campus because of this local tax income.

The subject of tuition surcharges to out-of-state students will be discussed in a later section.

As already suggested, the subsidy recommendations for 1969-1971 put forth by the Ohio Board of Regents will require additional student instructional charges in order to balance instructional expenditures and instructional income. The student and other income needed in the second year of the current biennium and needed in the biennium 1969-1971 will be as follows *per quarter:*

	Student And Other Income 1968-69	Student and Other Income 1969-71
Academic Centers	$150	$170
Lower Division, Technical	150	170
Upper Division-Bac.-Prof.	160	200
Master's	320	300
Grad.-Professional	320	300
Doctor's & Medicine	240	300

It is immediately apparent that substantial increases in student instructional charges are involved in these budget recommendations. Such increase raise a number of issues of public policy. These could be debated at considerable

length. It will be sufficient here to summarize the arguments in a few words. This is a subject on which so-called experts are in disagreement.

Is has been traditional that publicly sponsored institutions of higher education should provide educational service to students at no cost or very low cost. The question now is whether this tradition has current validity or relevance. The tradition may have been useful when the United States was primarily an agrarian society, economically a capital-importing society, and educationally reliant in large part upon private colleges and universities. The United States is today a highly organized, industrialized, technically advanced, urbanized, and wealthy society. State institutions of higher education have had to provide most of the expansion in educational opportunity made available in recent years. Critics of rising state expense for higher education point out that most students in public institutions come from affluent families. Others observe that higher education provides direct economic benefit to those who graduate. It is estimated that the college graduate earns two to three times the income of the non-college graduate. Administrators and others in private colleges and universities claim that the low charges in public institutions have adversely affected their operations with their necessary high charges. It is said that the gap between charges at public and private institutions is too large.

It is also said that students will not value higher education it if it free or if it is provided at low cost. It is claimed that too many students enroll in public institutions because the expense is low and they don't know what else to do. Higher education is a serious business, and this fact can be emphasized, so the argument goes, only if higher education is expensive to the student. Otherwise, higher education appears to be another give-away.

There is an important change taking place in the higher education world which opens up the whole issue of public charges. More and more federal government programs–the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and the Higher Education Act of 1965, for example–provide financial assistance to students to meet increased charges by colleges and universities. These programs are of no financial assistance to public institutions unless these institutions increase their charges to students.

Finally, the Board of Regents wishes to record its own strong statement of position in this respect. The Board is willing to recommend increased charges to students *only* when these increases are accompanied by a state program of financial assistance to undergraduate students of low-income families. The Board strongly recommends a new program of instructional grants as set forth in the next chapter of this document. Under these arrangements, student instructional fees for an undergraduate student from a family with an annual income under $5,000 would be $100 a quarter, or only one-half of the amount for other student. For an undergraduate student from a family with an annual income between $5,000 and $7,500, the instructional charge would be $150 a quarter, or the amount charged during the current year 1968-69. The burden of paying the increased instructional charges would fall only upon students from families with an annual income in excess of $7,500 per year.

There are two incidental matters in connection with charges to students which must be mentioned. First, it must be remembered that students must pay a general fee in addition to an instructional fee. This general fee is as high as $50 a quarter on some campuses. The Board of Regents is opposed to any higher general fee and expresses the hope that the level of this fee can be kept below $50 a quarter at most state-assisted institutions. Secondly, administrators point out that fees must be collected from students quarter by quarter, and that as students drop out during the academic year student fee income declines. Administrators also wish to collect a uniform instructional fee from all undergraduate students. For this reason, the Board believes that the instructional fee under this budget should be fixed uniformly at $200 per quarter, or $13.35 per quarter credit hour, for all undergraduate students except as other income may make a lower charge feasible.

New Basis of Charges for Two-Year Institutions

It should be pointed out again that the student fee increases required by this budget program will not apply to community colleges as to other institutions. It would be desirable to place all two-year programs–those of community colleges, technical institutes, and university branches–on the same income formula. This formula might well be one in which the state would provide one-third of the necessary income, the county one-third of the necessary income, and the student one-third of the income. Moreover, it would be desirable to have the student in a two-year program pay the same charge whether or not he is enrolled in a technical program and whether or not he is enrolled in a general education program.

If such a new basis of income support were enacted into law in 1969, it could be put into operation in 1971, in the next biennium.

Out-of-State Students

The Board of Regents has been concerned for some time about the problem of subsidizing the out-of-state student, the non-resident of Ohio. It must be made clear that the problem is not whether the out-of-state student is desirable or not. Undoubtedly, the out-of-state student who is a resident in some other part of the United States or some other country does have a point of view and experience different from that of the Ohio resident. It may be useful to the Ohio resident to encounter this point of view and experience. The problem the Board of Regents is concerned

about is the financial influence of the current subsidy practice.

It seems evident that the current financial practice encourages a state-assisted institution of higher education to prefer an out-of-state resident to an in-state resident. Any state financial system with this result is faulty, since the primary purpose of a state system of higher education is to meet the educational needs of the residents of that state. Yet under current practices a university has a definite incentive to seek more out-of-state students. It is to the financial advantage of the university to do so, since for each such student the university obtains the same state subsidy as for in-state students and then collects more than twice as much in student fees and tuition surcharge as from the in-state student. Indeed, in the past six years one university has doubled its proportion of out-of-state students, no doubt in large part encouraged to do so by its financial benefit.

It should be remembered that in supporting a system of community colleges, technical institutes, and university branches, the General Assembly of Ohio has provided by law that no subsidy shall be paid for out-of-state students. The Board of Regents believes that the time has come for some limitation upon the financial support provided out-of-state students on the central campus of the eleven state universities.

The proportion of undergraduate out-of-state students on the central campuses varies a great deal. As of 1968-69 the proportion of undergraduate students enrolled from outside Ohio was approximately as follows:

	Percent
Akron	8
Bowling Green	9
Central State	28
Cleveland	-
Kent	11
Miami	18
Ohio	20
Ohio State	9
Toledo	10
Wright State	-
Youngstown	25

For historical reasons, Central State ever since it became a separate state college in 1951 has attracted a considerable proportion of out-of-state students. The number of Ohio residents attending the University has not expanded as had been hoped or expected by many persons. Since Youngstown developed as a private institution with relatively low charges and was located only about ten miles from the Pennsylvania state line, the University has attracted a large number of Pennsylvania residents. Other universities have had a fairly large number of students coming from outside Ohio. The largest number is enrolled at Ohio State, although the proportion is not so high there as elsewhere.

In its Master Plan of June, 1966, the Ohio Board of Regents recommended that the state universities limit out-of-state enrollment to 20 percent of an entering freshmen student group. There has been no means available to the Board, however, to enforce this recommendation. As a long-range objective the Board of Regents proposes that not more than 5 percent of the undergraduate enrollment be considered eligible for state financial subsidy.

Because of the severe financial impact which such a restriction would have upon certain institutions in the biennium 1969-1971, the Board recommends that this limitation be applied to the enrollments of the biennium 1971-1973. As a compromise at this time, it is proposed that 75 percent of actual out-of-state undergraduate enrollments be subsidized in 1969-70 and that 50 percent of actual out-of-state undergraduate enrollments be subsidized in 1970-71.

The out-of-state student, as we have noted, pays the same instructional fee and general fee as the Ohio resident. In addition, the out-of-state students pays a tuition surcharge. In 1968-69 this surcharge amounts to $200 a quarter. Thus, the fee charges to the out-of-state student in 1968-69 compared with those of an Ohio resident are as follows:

	Ohio Resident Fees Per Quarter	Out-of-State Fees Per Quarter
Instructional Fee	$150	$150
General Fee	$10 - 50	$10 - 50
Tuition Surcharge	-	$200
	$160 - 200	$360 - 400

Under the expenditure requirements for 1969-1971, the Board of Regents believes there is reason to increase the tuition surcharge to a level approximately equal to the cost of the educational service provided. As a result, the fee charges in 1969-1971 for undergraduate students would be as follows:

	Ohio Resident Fees Per Quarter	Out-of-State Fees Per Quarter
Instructional Fee	$200	$200
General Fee	$10 - $50	$10 - $50
Tuition Surcharge	-	$250
Total	$210 - $250	$460 - $500

Other Instructional Subsidies

In addition to the instructional subsidies based upon enrollment, the Board of Regents has recommended supplementary subsidies where these seem to be necessary. These supplementary subsidies for the current biennium and as recommended for the biennium 1969-1971 are as follows:

	1967-68 Actual	1968-69 Actual	1969-70 Recommended	1970-71 Recommended
Central State				
Operating Supplement	$ 548,300	$ 416,000	$ 600,000	$ 600,000
Fee Supplement	123,125	137,250	-	-
Cleveland State				
Academic Development	1,450,000	1,600,000	1,360,000	1,000,000
Rentals	300,000	300,000	-	-
Wright State				
Academic Development	400,000	400,000	400,000	400,000
Medical College of Ohio				
Current Operations	700,000	850,000	2,300,000	2,800,000
TOTAL	$3,521,425	$3,703,250	$4,660,000	$4,800,000

In the case of Central State University, the total enrollment continues to fall below 5,000 students.This has meant that the enrollment formula has not met the actual overhead needs of the university. Indeed, the amount provided in 1968-69 appeared to fall at least $175,000 below the requirements of Central State. It must be remembered that much of the academic plant at Central State is quite old and is expensive to operate and maintain. Accordingly, the Board of Regents recommends that that operating supplement should be fixed at $600,000 a year in the biennium 1969-1971.

There is no need to provide a fee supplement at Central State in the next biennium if the recommended student instructional grant program is enacted. The provision of law for a special student aid program at Central State should be repealed in favor of a student aid program available to all Ohio residents.

Cleveland State began operation in September, 1965, succeeding to the property and program of the former Fenn College, a privately sponsored institution. Because the enrollment of Fenn College was declining and because the capacity of the capital plant was limited, Cleveland State has had to receive supplementary financial assistance in preparation for the opening of a new plant and for the introduction of an expanded instructional activity. Faculty and administrative staff have been recruited in advance of a sizeable enrollment expansion which will occur when the first phase of the capital improvement plan is completed. Unfortunately, delays over which the University had no control have postponed the completion of the new plant until 1970. It is necessary, therefore, to continue the special academic development supplement through the next biennium, although at a reduced level.

Wright State University became a separate university on October 1, 1967. Previously it had been a university branch administered jointly by Miami University and The Ohio State University. The University has an entirely new campus northeast of Dayton and has expanded to a full-time equivalent enrollment of 5,600 students in 1968-69. The University has needed supplementary financial assistance in preparing for enrollment growth and expansion of instruction at the master's degree level. This assistance needs to be continued in 1969-1971.

The Board of Regents expects that supplementary instructional assistance to Cleveland State and Wright State can be terminated in the biennium 1971-1973.

Finally, the current operating appropriation for the Medical College of Ohio at Toledo cannot be based upon a student subsidy formula. The Medical College will enroll some 25 beginning students in temporary facilities in September, 1969. In the meantime the Medical College has been in the process of recruiting staff for the full operation of a medical school when the facilities for this become available. The Medical College has also begun a research program and is rendering professional services to the medical profession generally in northwestern Ohio.

As of September, 1968, the Medical College had a total staff of 67 persons, of whom 42 were instructional personnel, 13 secretarial personnel, and 12 administrative personnel. In 1969-70 the Medical College expects to have a staff of 82, including 50 instructional and research personnel, 17 secretarial personnel, and 15 administrative personnel. All personnel are full-time, and the average salaries of instructional, research, and administrative personnel are necessarily high because of the generally high level of remuneration in the medical profession. There are also start-up costs in supplies and equipment to provide. Under these circumstances, it is necessary for the state appropriation for current operations at the Medical College of Ohio at Toledo to come to $2,300,000 in 1969-70 and to $2,800,000 in 1970-71.

New Instructional Programs

The Ohio Board of Regents has recommended that two new instructional programs be added in 1969. One of these would be a university branch campus in Celina, and the

other would be the merger of Cleveland-Marshall Law School with the Cleveland State University. The expense of these two new programs is shown as a separate appropriation recommendation.

The Board of Regents has recommended that the facilities of the Western Ohio Foundation in Mercer County be acquired and operated as a university branch campus. The trustees of the Foundation have agreed to turn over the property to the State of Ohio for operation. Previously, Ohio Northern University has provided a two-year program of instructional through these facilities, but Ohio Northern has requested release from its contract in 1969.

The Cleveland-Marshall Law School, a private, non-profit, separate law school, has sought a merger with Cleveland State University, and the Board of Regents has recommended that appropriate legislation to effect such a merger be enacted by the Ohio General Assembly in 1969. The instructional expenditures for this merger must then be added to the instructional budget.

Changing Emphasis in Programs

The budget appropriations recommended herein do not indicate adequately a major thrust in the instructional programs of higher education. The recommendations of the Governor's Task Force on Vocational and Technical Education set forth in the report released on January 9, 1969, call for a substantial expansion of technical education programs throughout Ohio. The enrollment estimates at the beginning of this chapter project a more than three-fold increase in technical education in 1969-1971 over the biennium 1967-1969. And this increase should be only a beginning.

It will be impossible, however, to advance technical education enrollments to the level of 30,000 or 40,000 students envisaged by the Governor's Task Force until additional facilities are constructed for these programs. The needs for such facilities and the location of them are set forth in the Task Force report and will be restated in the Board of Regents' recommendations for capital improvements for the biennium 1969-1971. In turn, this will mean increased operating expenditures in the biennium 1971-1973.

Organization

The state-assisted system of higher education in 1969-1971 would consist of the following units:

State universities	11
State-affiliated university	1
Medical College of Ohio	1
Community Colleges	4
Technical Institutes	5
University branches	19
Academic centers	9
	50

Three of the academic centers in Cuyahoga County can be terminated when the new downtown campus of Cleveland State University is fully in operation. This should be realized not later than September, 1971. The other six academic centers appear to serve a useful purpose at the present time. Their usefulness needs to be re-examined from time to time.

Otherwise, there are 41 state-assisted instructional campuses in Ohio, not including certain special research facilities. Together, these campuses provide a comprehensive array of instructional opportunities for the youth of Ohio.

The actual and projected distribution of enrollments by the various organizational units of the state-assisted system of higher education is shown in Table 5 at the conclusion of this chapter.

It must be emphasized that the state universities, state-affiliated university, community colleges, technical institutes, and other units are entirely responsible for the management of the financial resources made available to them. The Board of Regents has no authority over personnel, salaries, purchasing practices, personnel utilization, facilities utilization, or other aspects of management. The efficiency and the effectiveness of higher education operations depend upon the boards of trustees, the administrative officers, and the faculty of each state-assisted institution of higher education.

The Department of Finance and the Education Review Committee set up by the 107th General Assembly have made inquiries during 1968 into the management efficiency and effectiveness of state-assisted institutions of higher education. These studies had not been completed at the end of the calendar year 1968, but they had gone far enough to suggest the need for a number of improved management practices. This whole subject will require further attention in 1969-1971.

There are demands from civil service employees of the state universities for higher wages and more fringe benefits. Unions of employees have also demanded collective bargaining arrangements and written agreements. All of these are matters which will no doubt be considered and hopfully resolved by the General Assembly in 1969.

In finding needed and competent persons to fill the operating jobs on university campuses, the state universities may need to develop their own training programs. In addition, the state universities might obtain personnel by entering into cooperative work-study arrangements with vocational high schools and with technical education programs.

Summary

The instructional activities of state-assisted institutions of higher education are supported by state subsidies and by student fee and other instructional income. The Ohio Board of Regents has set forth herewith a minimum standard of expenditure requirements for these institutions based upon programs and levels of instruction. As explained herein, these expenditure requirements, if they are to be met, will necessitate an increase in state subsidy *and* an increase in student fee and other income.

If the state subsidies are decreased below the support factors recommended here, then student fee and other income will have to be increased. If the student fee and other income expectations are to be decreased, then state subsidies will have to be increased.

The Board of Regents is convinced that for the biennium 1969-1971 it has set forth minimum expenditure requirements in order to permit the proper current operation of the various state-assisted institutions of higher education. These expenditure requirements must be met from the sources of income available to each institution. It must be repeated that the Board of Regents has endeavored to set forth *total* expenditure requirements as well as recommended state subsidies.

The following data indicate the two items of income in relation to the total instructional expenditure needs for the biennium 1967-1969 and the biennium 1969-1971:

	Projected Instructional Income 1967-68	Projected Instructional Income 1968-69	Projected Instructional Income 1969-70	Projected Instructional Income 1970-71
State Subsidies	$134,387,730	$162,101,350	$192,745,500	$200,837,500
Fees and Other Income	94,772,450	102,120,100	130,138,500	139,168,200
	$229,160,180	$264,221,450	$322,884,000	$340,005,700

It is evident from these figures that a larger proportionate increase in instructional fees and other income is projected for the biennium 1969-1971 than in state subsidies.

TABLE 5

Full-Time Equivalent Enrollment*
State-Assisted Institutions of Higher Education
1967-1971

Universities	1967-68 Actual	1968-69 Actual	1969-70 Projected	1970-71 Projected
Akron				
Lower Division	6508	6676	6556	6984
Technical	-	-	500	600
Upper Div./BP	2832	4134	4410	4800
Master's	503	575	650	750
Graduate-Prof.	229	242	250	275
Doctoral	73	134	150	150
Total	10145	11761	12516	13559
Bowling Green				
Lower Division	6869	6836	6988	6921
Upper Div./BP	5460	6358	6785	6995
Master's	562	692	725	775
Doctoral	99	211	250	250
Total	12990	14097	14748	14941
Central State				
Lower Division	1637	1438	1388	1450
Upper Div./BP	968	1089	1004	965
Master's	68	63	75	75
Total	2673	2590	2467	2490
Cincinnati				
Lower Division	10096	11482	11450	11750
Nursing	88	94	115	135
Master's	1356	1472	1700	1750
Graduate-Prof.	448	469	500	550
Doctoral	384	916	1025	1025
Medical	394	431	435	435
Total	12766	14864	15225	15645
Cleveland				
Lower Division	4414	3840	4538	5023
Upper Div./BP	2156	3389	3832	4211
Master's	59	115	175	225
Graduate-Prof.	-	-	470	500
Total	6629	7344	9015	9959
Kent				
Lower Division	9201	8468	8611	8441
Upper Div./BP	8196	10390	10720	10918
Master's	1375	1346	1500	1675
Doctoral	266	588	600	600
Total	19038	20792	21431	21634

Table 5 Cont'd.	1967-68 Actual	1968-69 Actual	1969-70 Projected	1970-71 Projected
Miami				
Lower Division	6214	5784	5637	5465
Upper Div. /BP	5633	6011	6015	5811
Master's	560	617	700	800
Doctoral	70	134	200	200
Total	12477	12546	12552	12276
Ohio				
Lower Division	7973	8487	7929	7545
Upper Div./BP	8295	8805	9125	9205
Master's	822	817	950	1150
Doctoral	476	519	550	550
Total	17566	18628	18554	18450
Ohio State				
Lower Division	17780	17135	17456	17445
Upper Div./BP	15975	18525	18928	18830
Master's	2845	2967	3275	3450
Graduate-Prof.	1466	1369	1425	1450
Doctoral	2192	2703	3000	3000
Medical	1223	1248	1275	1275
Total	41481	43947	45359	45450
Toledo				
Lower Division	6443	6327	6633	6840
Technical	--	--	400	500
Upper Div./BP	2778	3697	3789	3960
Master's	472	626	700	775
Graduate-Prof.	322	446	475	500
Doctoral	59	87	150	150
Total	10074	11183	12147	12725
Wright State				
Lower Division	2601	3514	4300	4700
Upper Div.—BP	1211	1709	2150	2740
Master's	175	388	450	500
Total	3987	5611	6900	7940
Youngstown				
Lower Division	7450	6493	6712	6735
Upper Div./BP	3335	5328	5494	5727
Master's	--	98	150	200
Total	10785	11919	12356	12662
All Universities				
Lower Division	87186	86480	88198	89299
Technical	--	--	900	1100
Upper Div./BP	56927	69529	72367	74297
Master's	8797	9776	11050	12125
Graduate-Prof.	2465	2526	3120	3275
Doctoral	3619	5292	5925	5925
Medical	1617	1679	1710	1710
Total	160611	175282	183270	187731

Table 5 Cont'd

	1967-68 Actual	1968-69 Actual	1969-70 Projected	1970-71 Projected
Community Colleges				
Cuyahoga				
Lower Division	5692	7000	8050	8400
Technical	632	1140	1400	1500
Total	6324	8140	9450	9900
Lakeland				
Lower Division	594	906	730	1080
Technical	66	160	620	720
Total	660	1066	1350	1800
Lorain				
Lower Division	1998	2067	2200	2500
Technical	222	321	500	550
Total	2220	2388	2700	3050
Sinclair				
Lower Division	1309	1318	1570	2200
Technical	146	250	580	700
Total	1455	1568	2150	2900
All Community Colleges				
Lower Division	9593	11291	12550	14180
Technical	1066	1871	3100	3470
Total	10659	13162	15650	17650
Technical Institutes				
Clark				
Lower Division	292	378	540	750
Technical	33	135	185	250
Total	325	513	725	1000
Columbus				
Lower Division	527	430	675	975
Technical	59	197	225	325
Total	586	627	900	1300
Four County				
Lower Division	--	--	185	275
Technical	--	--	65	100
Total			250	375
Jefferson				
Lower Division	--	166	315	380
Technical	--	70	110	120
Total		236	425	500
Penta County				
Lower Division	472	490	625	750
Technical	52	200	225	250
Total	524	690	850	1000

Table 5 Cont'd.

	1967-68 Actual	1968-69 Actual	1969-70 Projected	1970-71 Projected
All Technical Institutes				
Lower Division	1291	1464	2340	3130
Technical	144	602	810	1045
Total	1435	2066	3150	4175
Branches				
Northeast				
Ashtabula				
Lower Division	666	681	825	910
Technical	--	--	75	90
Total	666	681	900	1000
Canton				
Lower Division	1137	1509	1970	2425
Technical	--	--	160	225
Total	1137	1509	2130	2650
Columbiana				
Lower Division	552	697	575	650
Technical	--	--	350	400
Total	552	697	925	1050
Tuscarawas				
Lower Division	274	467	550	620
Technical	--	--	50	60
Total	274	467	600	680
Warren				
Lower Division	447	457	575	735
Technical	--	--	175	215
Total	447	457	750	950
Northwest				
Firelands				
Lower Division	279	413	650	800
Lima				
Lower Division	929	936	1100	1250
Central				
Lancaster				
Lower Division	378	407	450	510
Mansfield				
Lower Division	976	842	1340	1650
Technical	--	--	60	100
Total	976	842	1400	1750
Marion				
Lower Division	405	451	585	675
Newark				
Lower Division	571	608	750	850

Table 5 Cont'd.

	1967-68 Actual	1968-69 Actual	1969-70 Projected	1970-71 Projected
Southeast				
Belmont				
Lower Division	635	707	720	825
Chillicothe				
Lower Division	449	420	500	595
Portsmouth				
Lower Division	570	591	620	700
Zanesville				
Lower Division	569	614	640	710
Southwest				
Walters				
Lower Division	584	1175	1250	1425
Technical	--	--	150	175
Total	584	1175	1400	1600
Hamilton				
Lower Division	83	374	700	800
Technical	--	--	55	65
Total	83	374	755	865
Mercer County				
Lower Division	--	--	310	390
Middletown				
Lower Division	901	826	1015	1325
Technical	--	--	55	75
Total	901	826	1070	1400
All Branches				
Lower Division	10405	12175	15125	17845
Technical	--	--	1130	1405
Total	10405	12175	16255	19250
Academic Centers				
Akron-Extension	--	11	350	550
Bedford	219	247	270	285
Bryan	73	83	85	90
Elyria	188	57	--	--
Euclid	392	412	440	470
Fostoria	119	112	120	130
Fremont	169	137	145	155
Geauga	203	256	295	330
Ironton	317	269	275	300
Lakewood	383	461	490	520
Norwood	65	--	--	--
Orrville	107	125	140	150
Piqua	92	132	150	175
Tri-County	--	191	225	275
Wadsworth	331	459	515	570
Total	2658	2952	3500	4000

Table 5 Cont'd.

	1967-68 Actual	1968-69 Actual	1969-70 Projected	1970-71 Projected
Summary — All Institutions				
Academic Centers	2658	2952	3500	4000
Lower Division	108475	111410	118213	124454
Technical	1210	2473	5940	7020
Upper Div./BP	56927	69529	72367	74297
Master's	8797	9776	11050	12125
Graduate-Professional	2465	2526	3120	3275
Doctoral	3619	5292	5925	5925
Medical	1617	1679	1710	1710
Total	185768	205637	221,825**	232,806**

*Enrollments receiving state subsidy only.

**Includes 470 and 500 students in the Cleveland State Law program and 310 and 390 students at the Mercer County branch in the 1969-70 and 1907-71 years, not shown in other enrollment summaries.

Chapter 2 Student Aid

Student aid involves financial assistance to students in meeting their direct, individual expenses in enrolling for undergraduate or graduate study. As has been mentioned, Ohio's state-assisted institutions of higher education must collect an instructional fee and a general fee (for special services) from each student who is a legal resident of the state. A tuition surcharge is collected from the out-of-state student. If the student lives away from home, he must pay room and board costs. There are also incidental costs, such as text books, laundry, travel to and from home, clothing, and recreation. All of these items can become quite sizeable in total for a three-quarter academic year.

For an Ohio resident who is an undergraduate student, it has been estimated that a minimum personal expenditure budget for a three-quarter academic year at a state-assisted institution in 1969-70 would be as follows:

	Commuting Student	Campus Student
Instructional Fee	$600	$600
General Fee	90	150
Room and Board	-	960
Books	100	100
Laundry and Personal	300	300
Total	$1,090	$2,110

No costs of travel or of commuting have been included in the above totals.

This minimum budget for an undergraduate student would be substantially higher if the student were a non-resident enrolling in a state-assisted institution, or if the student were enrolled in a privately sponsored college or university. For the non-resident enrolled in a public institution, the costs would be at least $750 more than the $2,110 listed above, while for the Ohio resident enrolled in a private institution the costs would be on the average $1,000 more than those shown above.

The individual student may meet the personal costs of higher education in a variety of ways: family earnings and savings, student earnings and savings, and student aid. Various studies made from time to time have indicated that most students obtain their financial support while enrolled in higher education from family and individual earnings and savings.

It is apparent that the opportunity for higher education is dependent to a considerable degree upon the family economic circumstances of the individual student. In particular cases a determined and highly motivated student may obtain a college education upon his own individual initiative. Such a student usually has to enroll on a part-time basis and obtain part-time or full-time employment as well. In some instances students may obtain scholarship, grant, or loan assistance as well.

The whole subject of student aid is a complicated one. It involves such questions as (1) assistance based upon ability or financial need, (2) the form of assistance (scholarships, grants, loans, employment), and (3) the amount of assistance. Moreover, the financing of such assistance is an important concern to the college or university undertaking to help students in meeting their costs of college enrollment. Our discussion here is concerned with the undergraduate and not the graduate student.

In general, we may note here that the State of Ohio has not in the past undertaken to provide any financial resources for students enrolling at a public or private institution. The prevailing attitude has been that the State of Ohio provides financial assistance to those seeking higher education by supporting public institutions of higher education. As the state-assisted institutions have had to obtain income from student fees, this prevailing attitude has necessarily come under increasing question.

In 1961 the General Assembly established the Ohio Student Loan Commission which has set up a system of guarantees for loans to students made by commercial lending institutions. The undergraduate student must arrange to borrow up to $1,000 per year, and the bank or lending agency may then seek a guarantee up to 90 percent of the loan from the Ohio Student Loan Commission. This program has been helpful in extending the opportunity for students to obtain loans with which to finance their higher education expenditures.

Since 1958 the federal government has become more and more involved in providing financial resources directly to public and private colleges and universities for student aid purposes. First, there were provisions for student loan funds and for fellowship funds to graduate students. Subsequently, these programs were augmented by programs of educational opportunity grants (for low income students) and work-study grants. The experience of Ohio's state-assisted institutions of higher education has been that the federal funds for these various programs have never been sufficient to meet the student demand for such assistance.

In addition to federal government funds, state-assisted institutions have obtained private gifts and grants for student aid purposes. There are a few private foundations in Ohio which have made grants to colleges and universities for scholarship and loan funds. Corporations have also made such grants. Alumni contributions have been used for student assistance. In some cases individual gifts and bequests to colleges and universities have created endowments to support student assistance efforts. In some instances, boards of trustees of public institutions have authorized a waiver of instructional fees as a form of student assistance. The Board of Regents has grave doubts about the wisdom of such a waiver policy.

At public institutions, it seems likely that the most extensive form of financial assistance available to students has been employment. On a campus with extensive housing facilities there are student jobs available in dining halls and in residence halls. Students may be employed in maintenance jobs, in recreational and other facilities (intramural gyms, bookstores, snackbars and dining rooms), in laboratories, museums and libraries, and as classroom assistants. Much of the part-time employment for these kinds of work is usually made available to students, and the number of those employed may be as high as 15 percent of the enrollment.

Privately sponsored colleges and universities have also encountered problems in meeting their needs for student assistance. As student charges have advanced in recent years (about 100 percent in the past ten years), a portion of the additional income thus realized has been earmarked for student loan purposes. The income reserved for student assistance is income which might otherwise be available to support the instructional program itself. Thus, when outside and special income is made available to a private college or university for student assistance, it may displace general income utilized for this purpose and so actually increase the income available to support the instruction program.

Nothing has been said here about various foundations, corporations, unions, clubs, associations, and individuals who undertake directly to provide financial assistance to particular students. There are many scholarships – as those of the National Merit Scholarship Corporation – which are awarded directly to students and not awarded through the college or university in which a student may enroll. The number of these scholarships awarded throughout the United States is sizeable, although they reach only a small proportion of all the undergraduate students in the country.

Colleges and universities, public and private, may utilize their student aid resources for two primary purposes: to attract students of ability and to assist students of limited or negligible family and individual income. Actually, these two purposes are frequently in conflict; only occasionally are they complementary one to another.

Colleges and universities are eager to recruit students of outstanding academic promise. It is these students who give an institution a reputation for academic excellence, and frequently these students come from families of relatively high income status. Indeed, there are those who argue that scholarship awards should recognize individual achievement, not family economic circumstances. In some instances, honorary scholarships or scholarships of a token amount only ($100 or $200 a year) are awarded to outstanding students regardless of family income.

Scholarships or grants may be employed to recognize outstanding ability other than academic achievement. Scholarships or grants may be awarded for musical talent, dramatic talent, artistic talent, writing talent, and athletic talent. In addition, scholarships and grants may be awarded when a college or university is seeking to develop a particular field of study such as architecture, journalism, social work, nursing, dietetics, dental technicians, and other programs.

In providing employment to students, a college or university will generally be disposed to hire students with a particular aptitude or interest in the job, whether it be library, laboratory, classroom, dining hall, maintenance or other work. College and university employers, like all employers, are seeking good workers: those who are punctual, reliable, competent, thorough, and loyal. The income need of the student is likely to be of less concern to the supervisor than the job performance of the student-worker. It is difficult to find fault with this attitude on the part of college and university supervisors.

On the other hand, there are a good many students of limited financial resources who wish to enroll in a college or university as a means of preparing themselves for a technician or professional position. Such students may not be of outstanding ability but rather may possess good or average abilities. These students are needed to help meet the labor supply demands of the American economy. These students should not be overlooked or ignored simply because they come from families of limited financial circumstances.

An Ohio Student Aid Program

The Ohio Board of Regents believes that the time has come when the State of Ohio should enter more actively into the whole field of student aid. It must be understood that an Ohio student aid effort is not expected to pre-empt this activity or to displace existing student aid financing by the federal government, private business and foundations, voluntary groups, college and university fund-raising, or institutional employment. The student aid program set forth herein is intended to be supplementary to these other endeavors.

An Ohio student aid program is all the more essential at this time for two reasons. First, state-assisted institutions are continuing to depend financially upon increased fee charges to students. These larger fees should be accompanied by some arrangement whereby students from families of limited financial means will not be required to find the income for these increases from personal sources. Secondly, the Board of Regents has been told that private colleges and universities in Ohio have the capacity to enroll more students and that the high student charges of these institutions compared with the much lower student charges of the public institutions is preventing the full utilization of private facilities. It would, therefore, seem desirable to provide some limited financial assistance to Ohio students whereby they might better be able to meet the higher charges of the privately sponsored colleges and universities.

The Ohio Board of Regents recommends that the General Assembly in 1969 enact an instructional grant program to provide financial assistance to undergraduate students upon the basis of family income status. It must be emphasized that this is a *grant* program. The stipulated financial assistance would be available to *all* undergraduate students depending upon family income. This is not a scholarship program to recognize outstanding academic achievement or promise. Rather, it is a grant program to assist all Ohio students of many different levels of academic ability.

In order to qualify for financial assistance under this program, apart from family income status, an undergraduate student would have to be accepted for admission to any accredited privately sponsored college or university in Ohio or to any state-assisted institution of higher education. So long as the undergraduate student remained in good academic standing at the college or university attended – that is, was making the required progress toward a degree (usually a 2.0 grade point average on a 4.0 scale) – the student would continue academically to be eligible for instructional grant assistance.

The amount of assistance which should be provided by this program is a matter on which there may be different points of view. There are certain state scholarship programs (available only to the top qualified students) and there are certain grant programs where the maximum award on a need basis ranges from $900 (Michigan) to $1,500 (in New York and California). It has been suggested by some that the maximum award in Ohio ought to be as high as $1,000 for a three-quarter academic year.

At the beginning the Board of Regents is not inclined to recommend so large a maximum award as those just cited. It is not clear at this time whether federal government programs for student assistance will be expanded or not. The more extensive the federal programs, the lesser need there may be for state funds to supplement federal and other funds. Moreover, it seems desirable to accumulate some experience in the actual operation of a state instructional grant program before a decision is made about the eventual maximum size of an instructional grant award.

The Board of Regents also wishes to emphasize the desirability of establishing a program which will be relatively simple to administer. It has been suggested that a fairly complicated analysis of individual family circumstances should be undertaken in every case. Moreover, such an analysis, the Board has been told, should include factors like family savings and family wealth. In a program of larger grants and in a program of general assistance, such an extensive analysis may be useful. For current purposes, the Board believes that a detailed inquiry into family economic circumstances is not justified.

It should be clearly understood that this program is one of financial assistance to students whose family income falls into certain specified classes. This is not a program of financial assistance to private colleges and universities. The purpose of the program is to assist Ohio students in attending the college or university of their choice in Ohio.

The program of instructional grants as recommended by the Ohio Board of Regents would be as follows:

	Amount of Instructional Grant Per Quarter	
Family Income	Instructional Fees Under $350 Per Quarter	Instructional Fees Over $350 Per Quarter
$5,000 and under	$100	$200
$5,000 to $7,500	50	100
Over $7,500	--	--

Two major problems will be encountered in the administration of this instructional grant program. One is that of defining family income. The other is that of verifying family income. The definition of family income should be specified in the legislation authorizing an instructional grant program. The verification of family income will be an administrative task, although penalties might very well be provided by state law for filing false information.

Family income should be the adjusted gross income of the family as reported for federal income tax purposes. This definition usually excludes the earnings of student dependents, and certainly it is undesirable from the point of view of higher education to take any action which would discourage student earnings. Adjusted family income would be the gross income for federal income tax purposes less a standard deduction for the federal income tax liability. Such a standard deduction on family incomes above $5,000 might well be fixed at 8 percent.

Family income is also affected by the number of persons in the family enrolled in higher education. In the case of family incomes above $5,000 per year where two or more

children are enrolled at the same time as full-time undergraduate students, then a reasonable procedure would be to deduct from the adjusted gross family income the dependents' allowance for each such child in order to determine the family income status in providing grant assistance to each student.

Insofar as verification of family income is concerned, this can be worked out by the administering agency in cooperation with the colleges and universities participating in the program. There are already federal government standards of family income reporting being observed by public and private colleges in connection with student loan applications and with educational opportunity grant applications. These same standards might be utilized in the administration of this program. Parents might be asked to sign a waiver permitting a verification of gross family income by access to the forms filed with the Internal Revenue Service.

The Board of Regents recommends that it be designated the administrative agency for the instructional grant program primarily because the Board wishes to keep the administrative expense of the program at the lowest possible level. The Board believes that, as an existing state agency of higher education having extensive relations with public and private colleges and universities, it could undertake administration of the program with a minimum of additional cost.

The Board estimates that the cost of instructional grants for the biennium 1969-1971 would be as follows:

	1969-70	1970-71
Grant Awards	$12,525,000	$12,870,000

The Board of Regents has endeavored to determine as accurately as possible the number of full-time undergraduate students who might qualify in 1969-1970 and in 1970-1971 for instructional grant assistance under this program. The Board sought information from each state-assisted university and from each community college about the parental income of students enrolled in 1967-68. Such information had been collected on a sampling basis from incoming freshmen in connection with research about student characteristics undertaken by the American Council on Education. In addition, the Board was provided with a very extensive survey of over 50,000 Ohio college freshmen as of 1967 in which family income had been reported.

Based upon an extrapolation of these data applied to the total number of all undergraduate students expected to be enrolled in Ohio's public and private colleges and universities in 1969-1971, the Board arrived at the figures reported in Table 6 herewith. If these estimates of numbers of eligible students are correct, the expenses of the program would be as projected above. If the numbers of eligible students should be underestimated, the Board believes that preference should be given to meeting the needs of all freshmen first, the needs of all sophomores secondly, the needs of all juniors thirdly, and the needs of such seniors, especially in the lower income bracket, as can be taken care of.

It is assumed that the General Assembly will probably wish to provide, as has the Congress of the United States, that student grant assistance may be withdrawn from students engaging in disruptive activities.

TABLE 6

Numbers of Full-Time Students By Family Income Class and By Instructional Fee Charges 1969-1971

Family Income	Instructional Charges Under $1,000 for Three Quarters		Instructional Charges Over $1,000 for Three Quarters	
	1969-70	1970-71	1969-70	1970-71
Under $5,000	12,000	12,500	4,500	4,600
$5,000 to $7,500	24,500	25,000	8,500	8,700
	36,500	37,500	13,000	13,300

War Orphans Scholarships

At present, Ohio law (Chapter 5910 of the Revised Code) provides for a system of scholarships to war orphans residing in Ohio. The law provides for a War Orphans Scholarship Board and for scholarship awards in terms of exemptions from instructional fees at Ohio's state-assisted institutions.

The Board of Regents believes that exemptions or waivers of fees are fundamentally undesirable because they provide for a reduction in instructional income and for a financing of the benefit thus received by the staff of a college or university rather than by the State of Ohio. Such exemptions or waivers are especially undesirable when required by law.

The preferable course of action is to provide the funds with which to pay the cost of the appropriate instructional fees. At present, about 40 war orphan scholarship awards are being granted each year. A total of some 150 such awards may be in effect at any one time.

In 1969-1971 the approximate cost of such scholarship awards would be $90,000 a year, and the Board of Regents recommends that this amount should be appropriated for that purpose.

High Risk Student Loan Guarantees

The Ohio student loan guarantee program has been referred to earlier. Under current operations, this program tends to be of benefit primarily to students who come from families with some credit standing in their local community. It is understandable that, even with a 90 percent guarantee, commercial lending agencies are reluctant to make loans to students whose repayment ability is unknown or highly uncertain.

In order to remedy this situation and to encourage lending to "high risk" students of good academic potential, it will be necessary to enact additional legislation permitting some special financial incentive to lending institutions to make loans to students from low income families. It is understood that such legislation is being drafted and will be considered by the 108th General Assembly.

If legislation authorizing the guarantee of "high risk" student loans is enacted, additional funds will have to be made available to the Ohio Student Loan Commission in order to provide the appropriate financial incentive. The reserve funds which will be required to meet a beginning effort at guarantee of high risk loans will amount to $90,000 in 1969-70 and to $105,000 in 1970-71.

Summary

The Ohio Board of Regents repeats its position that the time has come for the State of Ohio to make its own beginning in providing direct instructional grant assistance to the state's young people of limited financial resources enrolling on a full-time basis as undergraduate students in accredited public and private institutions of higher education. This beginning will require enactment of legislation authorizing an instructional grant program as described herein. Such enactment will in turn necessitate the appropriation of funds with which to carry out such a program.

Chapter 3 Research

The principal research activity of the State of Ohio has been the support of the Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center located in Wooster. In recent years the General Assembly has also designated a part of the funds appropriated for the operation of University Hospitals at The Ohio State University as available for medical research. For the most part, however, research activity within the state-assisted institutions of higher education has been supported by federal government grants rather than by state government appropriations.

The instructional subsidies of the State have made possible some individual research activity by faculty members. In addition, state-assisted universities have received corporation grants, private foundation grants, and general gifts with which to support various research projects.

In 1963 the Ohio General Assembly began to recognize the importance of faculty research activity by the appropriation of a small amount of money available to provide special compensation to faculty members distinguished in research. In 1965 and again in 1967 these appropriations were continued as the Regents' Professorship program.

In 1967 still a further step was taken when an appropriation of $1,500,000 for each year of the biennium 1967-1969 was provided for university research. This was a beginning of providing funds for general university research, and it was a beginning which should be continued and extended.

Research is a purposeful endeavor by a scholar utilizing appropriate techniques of inquiry to discover and set forth new knowledge. The objective of new knowledge is its own justification. At the same time research and discovery are not processes separated from the practical problems of society. Indeed, it may be argued with considerable evidence that man's knowledge is generated by problems or concerns with certain practical situations. Moreover, knowledge is cumulative, building upon earlier ideas.

It is generally understood today that university research does have practical consequences. New products and new production processes in industry and business are frequently developed upon the basis of new knowledge explored by university research. The research and development achievements in medicine and in agriculture are well known, as are similar achievements in communication, atomic power, and space exploration. Economic growth is dependent in large part upon new technology, and new technology tends to be encouraged by research. Research in the social sciences and the humanities may be less spectacular and less specific in practical results; yet such research has helped develop man's capacity for decision-making in economic, social, and political matters. Such research has also enlarged man's sensitivity to individual values and cultural expression.

There is an appropriate general distinction to be made between research and development. Research, as already pointed out, is primarily concerned with the discovery of new knowledge. Development is primarily concerned with specific means of applying knowledge or experimentation to particular problems, whether these be problems in production, pollution, population, economics, race relations, or other items. Research is a process in large part carried on by university faculties. Development is a process in large part carried on by business, voluntary agencies, and specialized governmental agencies.

Yet, it is also obvious that research and development are closely linked with each other, and any distinction between the two is at best likely to be somewhat arbitrary. On occasion the twilight zone between research and development is labeled applied research or developmental research. Certainly research needs the stimulation of developmental problems, and developmental problems need the assistance of research.

University research is of major importance for two reasons. University research explores new knowledge. And university instruction of quality depends upon a continuing research activity. The state's investment in instruction cannot be fully realized without some investment in research. And Ohio's future as a major area of production and of economic growth depends both upon professional education and upon research and development.

Agricultural Research and Development

The Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center renders essential service to the agri-business activities located in Ohio. The agri-business volume in Ohio is approaching $9 billion a year, 20 percent of Ohio's $45 billion contribution to the nation's gross national product. The current goal is to increase this volume by about $250 million a year. In addition to state appropriations, federal government grants and contracts and other income are available to support the total operating budget of the Agricultural Research and Development Center, which in 1968-69 amounted to $6,700,000. The staff of the Agricultural Research and Development Center in the current year consists of 225 full- and part-time scientists, 240 full- and part-time technical and research assistants, and 300 civil service maintenance, operating, and clerical personnel.

The current operating state appropriations for the Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center in 1967-1969 and the recommended state appropriations for 1969-1971 are as follows:

Actual 1967-68	Actual 1968-69	Recommended 1969-70	Recommended 1970-71
$3,962,226	$3,950,000	$4,358,000	$4,576,000

The Center requested appropriations of $6,775,000 in 1969-70 and $7,075,000 in 1970-71. These requests could undoubtedly be used to advantage in enlarging the research program of the Center and in expanding the development activities performed on behalf of the agri-business industry in Ohio. At the same time the Board of Regents believes that there are other research needs which must be given some attention in the State within the limits of available income.

In arriving at its recommendations for state support of the Agricultural Research and Development Center for 1969-1971 the Board has utilized a formula approach which seemed to be fair to the Center. The Board proposes a 5 percent increase for 1969-70 as a means of providing additional support for research and development activities of the Center. The Board further proposes a 5 percent increase in each year of the biennium in order to meet necessary salary increases, increased costs of equipment, and increased costs of operation.

The Board of Regents is convinced that the State of Ohio will continue to benefit in the future as it has in the past from its investment in agricultural research and development.

Medical Research

As has been mentioned earlier, a part of the current operating appropriation to the University Hospitals of The Ohio State University has provided support for medical research undertaken by the staff of the College of Medicine. This support has been used to supplement federal government, foundation, and other gifts and grants received by the University for medical research. The Board of Regents believes that the appropriation for medical research should be shown separately in order that the research support provided by the State of Ohio can be clearly indicated.

The Medical College of Ohio at Toledo reports that its faculty is now prepared to undertake research projects and that temporary facilities are available for these activities. Several faculty members of the Medical College recruited recently have brought research grants with them from their previous positions. At the same time no extensive medical research can be prosecuted by the faculty until the permanent facilities of the College are built.

The Ohio Board of Regents recommends that medical research appropriations for 1969-1971 be made as follows:

	Actual 1967-68	Actual 1968-69	Recommended 1969-70	Recommended 1970-71
College of Medicine,				
The Ohio State Univ.	$1,780,000	$1,812,000	$1,800,000	$1,800,000
Medical College of Ohio	-	-	200,000	200,000
Total	$1,780,000	$1,812,000	$2,000,000	$2,000,000

This recommendation will provide only a continuation of the 1968-69 amount for medical research at Ohio State. In the light of the rising prices occurring in the American economy, the amount will actually represent some reduction in the next biennium. There will be some advantage to the College of Medicine, however, in having a definite amount fixed for research purposes rather than an upper limit of research expenditures, depending upon the current operating needs of University Hospitals.

The amount for the Medical College of Ohio at Toledo represents the estimate of the College of practical research endeavors which can be undertaken in 1969-70.

No specific amount of medical research funds are recommended for the Medical College of the University of Cincinnati. Rather it is expected that a portion of the general research funds for the University of Cincinnati may be utilized for medical research.

University Research

The state-assisted universities of Ohio requested that $15,000,000 be made available in each year of the next biennium in support of various university research projects. It would be helpful to all the state-assisted universities if such funds could be provided, especially since federal support of research has been reduced substantially in the past year and may be expected to remain at lower levels in the next year or so.

Ohio's state-assisted institutions have not received from federal government research agencies what might be considered Ohio's "fair share" of research support in terms of Ohio's population, graduate enrollment, value added by manufacturing, and contribution to the federal government tax dollar. When this situation has been called to the attention of federal research officials, the invariable response has been that the quality of Ohio's research personnel and facilities did not compare favorably with those in other states more generously supported by research grants.

The Board of Regents recommends that further steps be taken at this time to strengthen the research capabilities and performance of Ohio's state-assisted universities. It is important to support research of potential usefulness to industry as well as to agriculture. To this end, it is proposed that $3,000,000 be appropriated in each year of the next biennium for this purpose. It is recommended that these funds be distributed by universities in the following manner:

The Ohio State University	$1,400,000
University of Cincinati	400,000
Ohio University	250,000
Akron, Bowling Green, Kent, Miami, Toledo($150,000 each)	750,000
Central State, Cleveland, Wright State, Youngstown ($50,000 each)	200,000
	$3,000,000

Ohio State requested approximately $7,500,000 for each year of the next biennium in support of research projects. The Ohio Board of Regents is recommending an appropriation of $1,400,000, although it recognizes that all the requests have merit. It is expected that the recommended amount will be expended as follows: engineering–$400,000; physical sciences–$250,000; biological sciences–$250,000; social, administrative, and behavioral sciences–$125,000; education–$50,000; humanities–$75,000; professional fields–$100,000; and a learning resources center–$150,000.

The University of Cincinnati undertakes extensive medical and other research. The appropriation of $400,000 each year should enable the University to expand its research activity. Since the University is the second largest center of graduate and graduate-professional study in the state, a corresponding appropriation should be provided.

The Board recommends that $250,000 be provided to Ohio University each year as the requirement to match a $500,000 grant from the National Science Foundation for development of the physics department.

The Board recommends $150,000 to each of the other state-assisted universities offering doctoral degrees and proposes that each university divide the amount among the worthwhile projects submitted to the Board. These include proposals for a silicate research institute at Toledo, a polymer science institute at Akron, a survey research center and a liquid crystals institute at Kent, and population research at Miami. The actual use of these funds would be based upon proposals submitted later by each university. This arrangement has been strongly recommended to the Board by the research administrators of the state-assisted universities.

For the four universities not currently authorized to offer the doctoral degree, the Board recommends the amount of $50,000 each to support individual faculty research.

Research Centers

The time has come when two new research centers should be created by the State of Ohio. These might be administered by The Ohio State University with an inter-institutional cooperative committee and with appropriate advisory committees. *Or* these centers might be established as separate corporations as is the case with the Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center, with an appropriate relationship to the higher education institutions of the state.

The first of these centers would be the Transportation Research Center. Extensive land purchase is already underway to provide for this facility and facility funds should be provided in 1969. It is desirable that a separate operating budget should be set up at this time for the staff of this Transportation Center.

About one-third of the Ohio labor force is employed in manufacturing industry. Ohio has ranked first in the nation in the production of rubber products, glass products, and machine tools; second in the nation in the production of primary metals and fabricated metals; third in the nation in the production of paper and of transportation equipment; and fifth in the nation in the production of food products, printing, chemicals, and electrical machinery. It is not often realized how large a part of Ohio's basic industrial production is actually for the benefit of the automotive industry. Indeed, Ohio is the principal producer of automotive parts in the United States.

The future of automotive transportation is of major concern to Ohio. The Transportation Research Center should be set up as a separate and visible agency to carry on research activity primarily of importance to automotive transportation. An integrated approach to motor vehicle and motor highway design and materials could be of primary importance to the future business and economic welfare of Ohio.

Secondly, there is need for an Ohio Resource and Environmental Conservation Research Center. This Center would be primarily concerned with water pollution control, air and environmental pollution, and water and other natural resources. This Center should be an expansion of biological survey, natural resources institute, and water resources activities already developed by The Ohio State University. This Center should include the Lake Laboratory and the Franz Theodore Stone Laboratory.

Over 95 percent of the water resources of Ohio are provided by inland lakes and streams, the Ohio River, and Lake Erie. About 28 percent of all water resources come from the Ohio River, about 24 percent from Lake Erie, and about 43 percent from inland lakes and streams. Ohio needs to conserve all existing water resources, and develop its surface water resources, especially through man-made impoundments. The major water problems of Ohio are to reduce the toxic materials coming into surface waters, to control the photosynthesis occurring in surface waters, and to improve water quality. Water resources and waste disposal need to be studied on a watershed basis, and must be considered in relation to air and land environment. Animal ecology is also important to water problems.

In order to assist the creation and operation of these new research centers, the Ohio Board of Regents recommends the following appropriations for current operations:

	Actual 1967-68	Actual 1968-69	Recommended 1969-70	Recommended 1970-71
Transportation Research	-	-	$150,000	$150,000
Resource and Environmental Conservation Research	-	-	350,000	350,000
Total			$500,000	$500,000

Regents' Professorships

The program of Regents' Professorships should be clearly identified also with the promotion of faculty research in Ohio's state-assisted universities. In the past, the program has been designed to provide extra compensation for faculty members distinguished for their research activity and achievements.

It is now proposed that, insofar as stipends are concerned, those faculty members designated as Regents' Professors should each receive $10,000 a year to support their research efforts. This sum might be used for research equipment, research assistants, research supplies and materials, and necessary travel to research centers. The appropriations for this purpose would permit 35 such awards in each year of the next biennium.

The appropriations recommended by the Board of Regents for Regents' Professorships are as follows:

Actual 1967-68	Actual 1968-69	Recommended 1969-70	Recommended 1970-71
$275,000	$190,000	$350,000	$350,000

Chapter 4 Public Service

Public service is the linkage between university instructional knowledge and research on the one hand and professional practice and public affairs on the other hand. Public service is the effort to update professional practice in the light of new knowledge and new techniques. Public service is the endeavor to promote technological transfer whereby research knowledge and development needs are interchanged between universities and industry. Public service is the provision of special assistance to agricultural families and other groups. Public service is rendering advisory and consultative assistance to governmental agencies. And public service brings general education and cultural (music, drama, literature, art) activities to those interested in broadening their knowledge and appreciation of public interests.

In the past, the State of Ohio has confined its public service support to two principal activities. These have been an agricultural extension service for farm families and hospital operations in connection with medical education. The Ohio Board of Regents has been instrumental in exploring certain other public service activities: remedial or compensatory education for college students; professional education for teachers interested in updating their knowledge and skill in specialized areas; and technological transfer service.

To be sure, the state-assisted institutions of higher education in Ohio undertake a large number of public service projects and activities without state government financial assistance. Special workshops and institutes are organized and conducted by a great many different instructional departments and other units of a college or university. Oftentimes these activities are supported entirely by fees paid by the individuals who participate in these seminars, workshops, and institutes. In recent years, also, the federal government has sponsored a number of these workshops and seminars, especially for school teachers in science, mathematics, modern foreign languages, and for school personnel engaged in student guidance and counseling. Sometimes business corporations and voluntary groups have sought university assistance in carrying on in-service and specialized professional training projects.

The Ohio Board of Regents believes that under present circumstances it is desirable to give more comprehensive attention to a variety of public service needs in Ohio. The Board has had this entire matter under review during the past year. As a result of special studies and of general concern with a number of different problems, the Board proposes to the 108th General Assembly an enlarged and more extensive program of public service to be provided through the state-assisted institutions of higher education.

State Technical Services

Under the State Technical Services Act of 1965 the federal government provides matching funds to states to carry out a program of technical service to business. The objective of this program is to promote technological transfer between universities and business. The Ohio Board of Regents has been designated as the state agency to direct the program which links university research ideas and interests with developmental concerns of business and industry. The State Department of Development has cooperated closely with the Board of Regents in the direction of this activity.

The technical services program consists of three kinds of effort, plus a monthly newsletter. A referral network consists of nine offices located at the University of Akron, the University of Cincinnati, Cleveland State, Kent State, Miami, Ohio State, Ohio, the University of Toledo, and Wright State. These offices are able to provide business with information about advisory and consulting personnel, research capabilities, and available technical information on various subjects. The network offices have close contact with federal scientific and engineering agencies. Secondly, two technical information centers have been set up, one at the University of Toledo to provide information about glass research and one at the University of Cincinnati to provide data on machine tool developments. Thirdly, special seminars have been organized and conducted on such subjects as precast concrete, instrumentation, fire safety design, laser beam technology, materials technology, machine tool applications, and random sampling techniques.

During the fiscal year 1968 the referral network handled some 600 different inquiries and over 20,000 contacts. Ten workshops were conducted by eight different universities (two private and six public) enrolling some 300 persons.

In order to expand this service and to have matching funds available for federal funds supporting this program, the Board of Regents recommends that $200,000 be appropriated for each year of the biennium 1969-1971.

University Hospitals

The University Hospitals of The Ohio State University are an essential part of the instructional program of the College of Medicine, since the clinical sciences must be taught in a hospital setting. At the same time the University Hospitals provide an important public service in the treatment and care of patients, both out-patients treated in various clinics and in-patients treated and cared for in hospital wards.

University Hospitals consists of 900 beds and some seven major clinics. In one year the University Hospitals afford medical care to over 100,000 out-patients, 30,000 emergency room treatments, and 25,000 in-patients. University Hospitals also carries on an education program for interns and residents and a continuing education program for doctors throughout Ohio. The continuing education program is self-supporting. In 1969-1971 University Hospitals will include on the staff some 50 interns and some 160 residents each year.

The state appropriation in support of University Hospitals amounts to about 25 percent of the current operating expenses; about 75 percent of the costs are defrayed from patient charges. The expense of medical care has been increasing substantially year by year. Medical equipment is more extensive and expensive; drugs have risen in cost; nursing and patient-care costs have risen; all supplies and equipment are more expensive. Fortunately, the average duration of the stay of patients in the Hospitals has been declining.

In order to meet this expense situation, the Board of Regents recommends that University Hospitals receive in 1969-1971 a 5 percent increase in appropriations for each year, with another 5 percent increase in the first year. Other expenses will have to be realized from charges to patients. The appropriations in support of University Hospitals would be as follows:

1967-68 Actual	1968-69 Actual	1969-70 Recommended	1970-71 Recommended
$4,270,000	$4,538,000	$4,968,000	$5,300,000

Tuberculosis Hospital

The State Tuberculosis Hospital is located adjacent to the Ohio State University Hospitals and management of the Hospital was transferred to the University in 1967. In the biennium 1969-1971 it is proposed to transfer the appropriation item for the Tuberculosis Hospital from the Department of Health of the State of Ohio to The Ohio State University. Because of the declining rate of bed occupancy in this hospital, the amount provided for its operation can be reduced. In another biennium it may be desirable to merge this hospital operation with all other hospital operations at Ohio State.

Since this appropriation is not an item of additional expense but rather a transfer item at a lower rate of expenditure in 1969-1971 than in 1967-1969, the amount involved has not been shown in the totals.

Cooperative Agricultural Extension Service

The Cooperative Agricultural Extension Service is a public service activity of The Ohio State University directed to provide consulting and advisory services to farmers, farm families, and agri-business enterprises. The Service receives financial support from the State of Ohio, from the federal government, and from county governments. For example, in the current fiscal year 1968-69 the income of the Service was obtained from the following sources: $2,150,000 from state government, $2,770,000 from the federal government, $1,675,000 from county governments, and $500,000 from miscellaneous sources and charges.

The Extension Service maintains two county agents in each of Ohio's 88 counties and also has a headquarters staff and ten area centers with from two to seven persons in each of these centers. The Extension Service concentrates its effort in the fields of farm operations and management, farm-related food and crop processing and distribution, farm family life, and farm youth. The Service reaches most of the 500,000 farm population of Ohio.

The Extension Service has presented a number of additional needs. The Service says that it ought to increase the number of farm specialists in its area centers by 18 persons qualified in the fields of farm managements, agronomy, animal industry, dairy industry, horticultural industry, and poultry industry; and another eight persons qualified in family life, farm youth, and community resource development. The Service reports that its levels of salary compensation for agents and specialists have lagged behind those of other Midwest states such as Michigan, Wisconsin, Illinois, and Iowa. The Service has requested that state appropriations be increased by about 50 percent in 1969-1971 over 1967-1969.

There continue to be some uncertainties about the extent of the activities of the Extension Service which are needed in such areas of concern as farm family living, farm youth, and community resources. There is certainly a continuing service which ought to be performed in providing the necessary connection between farm operations and management and agri-business operations and management on the one hand and state agricultural research and development on the other hand.

Under the circumstances, the Board of Regents has again used a formula in making appropriation recommendations for the Cooperative Agricultural Extension Service. This formula would provide a general 5 percent increase in the first year of the next biennium, plus a 5 percent increase in each year of the biennium to meet rising costs of operation. The appropriations to the Service would be as follows:

1967-68 Actual	1968-69 Actual	1969-70 Recommended	1970-71 Recommended
$2,150,000	$2,150,000	$2,415,000	$2,536,000

Teacher Institutes

Another group in society which has been singled out for special attention in recent years in obtaining an updating of professional knowledge and skill has been that of elementary, intermediate, and secondary school teachers. For some 10 years, especially since the enactment of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, certain federal government agencies have provided funds to universities with which to operate summer quarter institutes and workshops for school teachers–primarily teachers of science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages.

In 1968 the Ohio Board of Regents experimented in this general field by providing support for teacher institutes and workshops for the benefit of teachers of vocational education and of teachers in inner-city schools. The funds for support of these institutes were transferred from research purposes to public service purposes, since both were specified by the appropriation law. The Board of Regents retained two consultants in the summer of 1968 to make an evaluation of this activity. The consultants recommended that the program be continued in subsequent summers, at least for the time being. The deans of the 12 university colleges of education have also recommended that additional institutes and workshops be scheduled for 1969 and for 1970.

The colleges of education have submitted proposals for specific teacher institutes and workshops for 1969. Similar proposals would be prepared for 1970. A total of 50 workshops and institutes would be undertaken, enrolling some 1,200 teachers. The institutes would be divided as follows: Akron–4; Bowling Green–3; Central State–2 (in cooperation with Ohio State); Cincinnati–6; Cleveland State–6: Kent State–9; Miami–3; Ohio–4 (two in Cleveland); Ohio State–3; Toledo–3: Wright State–3; and Youngstown–2. The amount of $600,000 would be needed each year for this purpose; Akron–$62,000; Bowling Green–$60,000; Central State–$18,000; Cincinnati–$60,000; Cleveland State–$62,000; Kent–$84,000; Miami–$55,000; Ohio–$64,000; Ohio State–$50,000; Toledo–$32,500; Wright State–$32,500; and Youngstown State–$20,000.

The institutes would be divided approximately 27 for inner-city school teachers, two for teachers in Appalachia, and 21 for vocational teachers. Even in the workshops and institutes for inner-city school teachers, a particular subject of concern will be the elementary school role in introducing students to the world of work.

The summer quarter workshops would vary in length from one week to five weeks. The budget would include a stipend for teachers in the same amount which has been standard practice for institutes financed by the National Science Foundation, $75 a week. Other budget expenses would include payment of instructional fees for teacher participants ($20 a credit hour at the graduate level), special instructional materials, and supplementary instructional personnel.

These summer institutes and workshops are of major importance at the present time. If the State of Ohio is to make a major effort in affording job education to Ohio youth, then new instructional content and new instructional procedures must be devised and utilized by public school teachers. In addition, if vocational education opportunities are to be expanded, then more vocational teachers must be recruited. In large part, these vocational teachers will have to be found in business and industry; such teachers should be assisted to qualify for teacher certification as rapidly as possible. For these reasons, teacher institutes and workshops should be provided by the state for the next several years.

Corrections Education

The Board of Regents in 1968 was requested by the Ohio Probation and Parole Association and by the Ohio Crime Commission to make a study of corrections education provided by Ohio's state-assisted universities. The Board retained a consultant in this field who visited all of the state-assisted universities to determine what courses were being offered and what improvements might be desirable. The consultant's report was received in July, 1968.

The fundamental problem has been an inadequate number of persons prepared to handle the volume of probation and parole work which is now arising in the state's judicial and corrections operation. A corrections education program at the baccalaureate level would involve an inter-disciplinary specialized curriculum in sociology, psychology, and professional experience. Corrections personnel would like to have a work-study or intern arrangement to supplement formal course study. There is also probably a need to expand opportunities for professional education at the master's degree level in social work and in corrections.

The consultant has recommended to the Board that corrections education can be strengthened only if some senior person is placed in charge of this activity at the various state universities. This strengthening will not take place at this time if each university is dependent upon instructional subsidies based upon enrollment in order to obtain the financial resources for the program. The consultant therefore proposes that the Board of Regents provide separate support for a senior faculty member to specialize in corrections education and to develop appropriate liaison with probation and parole officials.

Accordingly, the Board of Regents recommends that an amount $24,000 be made available to each of ten state-assisted universities for the salary, secretarial assistance, and expenses of a senior faculty member to

develop and supervise an instructional program in corrections education. This sum of $24,000 in each of the next two years would go to the following state-assisted universities: Akron, Bowling Green, Central State, Cincinnati, Cleveland State, Kent, Ohio State, Toledo, Wright State, and Youngstown State.

Corrections education needs to be provided at those institutions where there is an interest in providing such an instructional program. Corrections education must also be provided in close cooperation with probation and parole agencies who are major employers of specialized personnel with particular competence to work with individuals on a parole or probation status.

In particular, the need for corrections education is pressing in major urban areas where individuals desire to improve their professional competence for such baccalaureate and master's degree programs. This need justifies the development and expansion of corrections education in a number of different locations throughout the state. At the same time, some concentration of effort is desirable, and it may be that some reduction in the number of universities participating in the program will occur.

Law Enforcement Education

At the request of the Ohio Crime Commission, the Ohio Board of Regents also retained a consultant in 1968 to make a report on law enforcement education in Ohio. The consultant's report was received in October.

It is unnecessary here to discuss at length the increased concern in the United States and in Ohio with the whole matter of efficient and effective law enforcement. A variety of actions may well be necessary in order to improve law enforcement administration. One line of action is improvement in the educational preparation of police officers.

In general, two or three observations about police and law enforcement administration are relevant in this connection. The customary entrance requirement for appointment as a police officer is that an individual be 21 years of age and be a high school graduate. Law enforcement agencies then depend upon in-service training to provide the necessary specialized preparation for performance of police duties. Some cities maintain police academies and an elaborate program of training. Training for local police officers may also be provided by other agencies, such as the Ohio Highway Patrol and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. It is not customary for police supervisors to be brought in from outside the service; there is no practice of lateral entry into police service; and all promotions are made from within the service. And there is no general requirement for additional education beyond that specified at the time of initial entry into the service.

The consultant to the Board of Regents found that a two-year curriculum in law enforcement was now being offered by the four community colleges, two state-assisted universities (Cincinnati and Youngstown), and one private university (Dayton). For the most part persons interested in law enforcement work are enrolled in this associate degree prior to initial entry into police service. In the autumn of 1968 there were approximately 700 persons enrolled in these courses.

The consultant also found that two state-assisted universities (Kent and Youngstown) and one private university (Dayton) were offering a four-year baccalaureate program in law enforcement education. There were about 400 persons enrolled in these baccalaureate programs in the autumn of 1968. There is a tendency for some police officers on their own initiative to seek further education beyond the high school level. Only occasionally do local governments offer any financial assistance to police officers seeking additional education.

The consultant has made various recommendations about the strengthening of law enforcement education, and his report has been made available to various interested organizations.

At this time, the Ohio Board of Regents is prepared to make only one recommendation about law enforcement education. As an additional form of public service, especially as a form of assistance to local governments, the Board recommends that $450,000 be appropriated each year in the biennium 1969-1971 to meet the instructional fee charges of any duly inducted police officer enrolling in a two-year or four-year law enforcement education curriculum at a state-assisted institution of higher education. It is likely that such officers would have to enroll on a part-time basis. The amount recommended for appropriation would initially assist 750 full-time equivalent police officers in undertaking a two- or four-year curriculum in law enforcement.

It may also be desirable to introduce these curricula, especially four-year curricula, at other institutions. The Board believes the person assigned to direct and supervise corrections education might also give attention to this field of professional education.

Labor Education Service

Very little has been done in Ohio in providing a labor extension or labor education service. The Ohio State University has established a small Labor Education and Research Service with a total staff of five persons. The budget for this Service has been provided from the general funds of the University.

The Board of Regents believes that a more concerted effort should be made at this time to organize and develop a program of continuing education for labor union

personnel. Such a program should be undertaken on an experimental basis at this time. It may well be that, in the course of events, a sizeable Labor Education Service activity may be justified and should be supported in this state.

Labor education service would involve university liaison with labor unions in developing appropriate educational assistance to unions. Such assistance might include the arrangement of seminars and workshops for union members on subjects related to university competence–subjects such as labor economics, parliamentary procedure, public speaking, and public affairs. Currently, any such institutes and workshops would have to be self-supporting, but it is possible that some of these short, non-credit courses would qualify for federal government financial assistance under Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Initially, it is proposed that $25,000 each be made available to four state-assisted universities to pay the salary of a senior faculty member, to provide secretarial assistance, and to meet expenses in establishing a labor education service. The four locations originally would be Akron, Cincinnati, Ohio State, and Toledo. The coordination of this activity should be provided by Ohio State.

College Study Improvement

During the current biennium, the Ohio Board of Regents has given a good deal of consideration to the subject of how to broaden higher educational opportunity for the disadvantaged student in Ohio who for a variety of family, cultural, and environmental reasons may complete a high school education with inadequate preparation for college study. It has become increasingly evident in recent years from a variety of local and national inquiries that a considerable number of high school students do not continue their formal education becuase of inadequate motivation, financial difficulties, and a low level of educational achievement. Moreover, the so-called disadvantaged students are even more numerous among white youth than among black youth.

Ohio by statute requires state-assisted institutions to admit any and every high school graduate regardless of his or her academic achievement. In the case of campuses with limited housing facilities for students, some state-assisted universities restrict the assignment of housing facilities to entering students upon the basis of academic performance and promise. This practice may be justified because of the concern of these universities in ensuring full and continued occupancy of their housing facilities in order to meet their operating and debt service obligations. No such restriction however, is applicable to commuting students.

A comprehensive program of assistance to disadvantaged students would involve at least four elements: (1) identification of potential college talent at the secondary school level: (2) supplementary preparation for college study for such students; (3) financial assistance to students to meet the individual costs of college attendance; and (4) supplementary tutoring during at least the first year of college study. Many of the state-assisted institutions of higher education have undertaken organized efforts to encourage disadvantaged students in all four of these ways. During the year 1968-69, the Board assisted various institutions in providing tutoring services. The state-assisted institutions of higher education have presented a wide array of proposals for providing assistance to disadvantaged students.

The Board of Regents has decided that the most appropriate action which should be taken at this time would be to provide funds to support supplementary instruction to high school students in preparation for college enrollment. Insofar as student financial assistance is concerned, the instructional grant program recommended herein will be of partial help to the state-assisted institutions. Insofar as tutoring of those enrolled for college study is concerned, the Board now believes that this activity might well be organized on a voluntary basis. Many students desire to be involved actively in the solution of current social problems, and surely no current social problem could have more meaning for the college students of today than providing tutorial assistance to disadvantaged youth on the campus where they both are enrolled.

The Board of Regents recognizes that secondary education–like pre-school, elementary, and intermediate education–is the responsibility of school districts under the supervision of the State Board of Education. The Board of Regents recognizes that secondary education should be adequate for all youth, regardless of their family and other circumstances. Yet, in realistic terms, the Board of Regents must also recognize that school districts do encounter a number of obstacles in providing the kind of secondary education experience the districts desire to offer. Moreover, in the past, several if not all the state-assisted institutions of higher education have found it useful to offer reinforcement or supplementary instruction for college-bound students. Indeed, such instruction is being offered at the present time supported entirely by charges to students.

At this time, the Board of Regents recommends the appropriation of $600,000 a year which would permit the organization and operation of 200 sections of 12 students each in the summer quarter of 1969 and in the summer quarter of 1970 at a cost of $3,000 per section. These supplementary college preparatory courses would be available at 40 different locations in the state, would provide instruction in English and mathematics, and would be available to high school students after their junior year of high school study. The student would not be charged any fees for such instruction, and the courses would not provide any credit toward a two-year or bachelor's degree.

Home Study Development

Only one state-assisted university in Ohio, Ohio University, has offered courses for credit by means of correspondence study. Ohio University in 1968-69 was offering about 150 different correspondence courses in such varied fields as accounting, botany, business law, chemistry, economics, engineering, English, geography, government, history, home economics, management, marketing, mathematics, physics, psychology, sociology, and statistics. Study by correspondence has been offered by other state universities and has also been available to members of the armed forces through the Unived States Armed Forces Institute, operated under contract by the University of Wisconsin.

Home study may be undertaken for college credit or for individual interest; it may be undertaken in general or specialized fields of learning. For the most part, home study courses are usually confined to introductory or core courses, and only a limited number of such courses will usually be applied toward a bachelor's degree. In a few instances, home study may be undertaken in conjunction with televised instruction.

There is a need to determine whether home study opportunity ought to be expanded in Ohio, and to determine the feasibility of extending such home study opportunity to certain courses in the field of technical education. The Board of Regents proposes in 1969-1971 to undertake, in cooperation with Ohio University, an inquiry into possible improvements and expansion of home study opportunity in Ohio. The Board proposes the appropriation of $250,000 in each year of the biennium for this purpose. Hopefully, an appropriate inquiry and development activity could be carried out for less than this amount of money. In such case, the remaining funds might be utilized for one or two other urgent studies mentioned below.

Teacher Education Study

The Conference of Deans of Education of the 12 state-assisted universities in December, 1968, submitted a proposal to the Board of Regents for a state-wide study and development of improved teacher education curricula. A consortium of the colleges of education in Ohio with the benefit of a federal government grant recently completed a study and development of an improved curriculum for elementary school teachers. The Conference of Deans believes that further efforts at improvement in teacher education curricula are especially appropriate in the biennium 1969-1971.

The Conference of Deans of Education points out that there are several particular concerns about public education which can be met in long-run terms only by the better education of teachers themselves. First, there is a need to rethink the objectives and programs of pre-school, elementary, intermediate, and secondary education in terms of the expectations of parents, students, teachers, the public, the school system (local and state), and colleges of education. The problems of the ghetto schools, both urban and rural, are especially acute today. The education operation must prepare itself to give greater attention to occupational education (the world of work) and to vocational education (preparation for jobs). Both of these areas of concern demand better definition, clarification of purpose, and improved instructional procedures. In the field of vocational education, for example, the variety of vocational education fields is not clearly understood (agricultural vocations, business vocations, building trades vocations, government service vocations, health vocations, industry vocations, and service vocations). There is an absence of understanding and agreement about the role of the school system in preschool education.

Secondly, the redefinition of school objectives calls for a reconstruction of school curricula, the preparation of better instructional materials, and the improvement of instructional processes. This kind of effort will take a long time to accomplish, but at a minimum a sense of direction is indispensable at present.

Thirdly, the role of the teacher must be reexamined; this role is critical in the whole educational endeavor. What is expected of the teacher by society, the profession, and the schools? How can colleges of education best contribute to the educational preparation of teacherr? How can colleges of education, the profession, and the State Department of Education best collaborate in the certification of teachers? How is the continuing professional education of teachers to be realized? These questions demand further or better answers at this time.

In the fourth place, colleges of education need to examine how they might improve their services to schools as organized enterprises. School districts in many parts of Ohio may have to be increased in size in order to afford students an effective set of educational programs at an efficient cost per student. How can colleges of education assist in this process?

There are miscellaneous problems also to be considered. Can the college preparatory program in public schools be improved so as to reduce the college dropout rate? How are vocational education teachers to be prepared in adequate numbers with both the appropriate vocational competence and the appropriate teaching competence? To what extent should teacher re-education be accomplished in cooperation with school districts and in the schools where teachers work?

It is proposed by the Board of Regents to establish a Teacher Education Study Policy Committee with a state-wide advisory committee. The Board would also appoint a study director. In turn, the organization of the teacher education study would involve cooperative working relationships with the colleges of education, the State

Department of Education, the Ohio Education Association, school officials, and others. It is hoped that this study could get underway in July, 1969, and be terminated during the fiscal year 1970-71. The study budget would require $320,000 in the first year and $180,000 in the second year.

Educational Television

Ohio has had an Educational Television Network Commission for 10 years, and has had four university television stations (Ohio State, Miami, Ohio, and Bowling Green) and four community educational television stations (Cincinnati, Cleveland, Toledo, and Newark) for an even longer period of time. The educational television stations are engaged in instructional broadcasting for schools and public broadcasting (public and cultural affairs telecasting) for the universities. These activities have been coordinated and encouraged insofar as possible by the Network Commission.

There are two special needs which should be met. One is to provide general coverage of the entire state by educational television. Large areas of the state are not now served by ETV. The other need is to improve the programming of educational television through better production and through better distribution. These two needs can be met only by increased funds available for capital facilities and increased funds available for current operations.

Capital facility requirements include new and enlarged telecast transmission facilities, new and enlarged production facilities, and network distribution facilities.

Current operating requirements include the costs of network interconnection and funds available for program production activities.

From the nature of the dual interest in educational television operations in Ohio—the interests of the State Department of Education in instructional broadcasting and of the universities in education for television and in public broadcasting—it would seem appropriate to divide the financial support of these operations and facilities between the State Board of Education and the Ohio Board of Regents.

The Board of Regents therefore recommends an appropriation of $500,000 each year of the next biennium for its share of network operations and production grants, along with a facilities appropriation of $4,000,000 for expanding and extending the university contribution to state-wide coverage and to production facilities.

Summary

As suggested at the beginning of this chapter, the Ohio Board of Regents favors a comprehensive effort at public service rather than a piecemeal approach. The recommendations contained herein, the Board believes, begin such a comprehensive approach.

Chapter 5 Administration

The Ohio Board of Regents is the central agency of state government concerned with higher education policy and operations in Ohio. The jurisdiction of the Board is limited in two ways. First, the authority of the Board is directed primarily toward the publicly sponsored institutions of higher education located in Ohio. The Board at present administers only a few items of legislation (state and federal) affecting the privately sponsored colleges and universitites in Ohio. Secondly, the Board of Regents has only limited authority in relation to the publicly sponsored institutions of higher education. The Board is a planning and coordinating agency. Most of its actions are in the form of recommendations which can only be implemented by action of the executive and legislative branches of state government. The Board of Regents has no authority or jurisdiction over the management of the capital and operating resources entrusted to the individual state-assisted institutions of higher education.

The Ohio Board of Regents receives funds from the federal government to administer phases or parts of four federal government programs in the field of higher education: Title I of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1968, Title I (continuing education) and Title VI (equipment grants) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, and the State Technical Services Act of 1965. The funds thus received for administrative purposes came to some $75,000 in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968. A similar amount will be received in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969. The Board has also received the actual funds for continuing education projects and for comprehensive facilities planning which have been distributed to public and private institutions of higher education.

It seems likely that one or more planning activities of the Board of Regents may have to be expanded in 1969-1971. A study ought to be started during the biennium to review the progress being made in expanding the opportunities for medical education in Ohio and to determine the need for another publicly sponsored and supported medical school in the State. A study needs to be made about how to improve the availability of information for high school students about admission to state-assisted higher education and about the student financial assistance. There may be a need, also, to study organizational arrangements which might encourage more efficient operation of the public higher education system in Ohio.

Rather than to request any specific amount of money for these studies, the Board of Regents recommends that such studies be authorized by the General Assembly for 1969-1971, and that these studies be funded by transfers from other appropriations which are not fully obligated during the biennium.

From the State General Revenue Fund, the Ohio Board of Regents requests two new positions, one professional and one clerical, to administer the recommended instructional grants program. The Board accordingly requests appropriation support as follows:

	1967-68 Actual	1968-69 Estimated	1969-70 Recommended	1970-71 Recommended
General Fund	$272,043	$330,000	$350,000	$356,000

Chapter 6 Summary

The Ohio Board of Regents is well aware that the appropriation recommendations set forth herein fall short of the requests and aspirations of the state-assisted institutions of higher education. The Board is well aware that public support of public higher education in Ohio has been less on a per capita basis and on a per student basis than that provided by many states, including many states in the central part of the United States.

At the same time, the Ohio Board of Regents wishes to express again its deep sense of appreciation to the 107th General Assembly for its substantial increase in appropriations to public higher education for the biennium 1967-1969. This increase was made possible only by an increase in the tax burden assumed by all citizens of the state.

The record in tax support of the current operations of public higher education for the past 16 years in Ohio is shown in Table 7. This record is extended through 1971 upon the basis of the appropriation recommendations put forth herein.

The notable aspect of the record is not just in the six-fold increase of appropriations between 1953-1955 and 1967-1969. The impressive achievement was an increase in the appropriations *per student* realized in 1967-1969 compared with previous biennia. For 1968-69 state appropriations amount to $859 per student, compared with $623 per student in 1966-67. This is an increase of more than one-third in the two-year period.

TABLE 7

Appropriations
and Appropriation Recommendations
for Higher Education
Current Operations
1953–1971

Year		Biennium
1953-54	$ 25,976,385	
1954-55	26,342,266	$ 52,318,651
1955-56	27,803,865	
1956-57	28,184,083	55,987,948
1957-58	36,188,194	
1958-59	38,232,604	74,420,798
1959-60	44,232,080	
1960-61	47,089,397	91,321,477
1961-62	52,013,780	
1962-63	54,482,675	106,496,455
1963-64	60,449,740	
1964-65	67,669,800	128,119,540
1965-66	84,864,100	
1966-67	93,100,330	177,964,430
1967-68	148,583,693	
1968-69	176,701,131	325,284,824
1969-70	230,651,500	
1970-71	235,640,500	466,292,000

The increase in tax support of the current operations of state-assisted institutions of higher education enabled the institutions to make considerable increases in faculty salaries in 1967 to 1969. In some instances, these increases were made at the sacrifice of needed expenditures for instructional supplies and equipment. But the Ohio record in average faculty salaries placed it among the top ten states in the United States insofar as public institutions of higher education were concerned.

It is true that appropriations per student ranged around the figure of $750 in the period from 1959 to 1963 and then fell below $650 in the period from 1963 to 1967. These figures are deceptive, however, since before 1963 the State of Ohio was not providing any financial support to any two-year programs at community colleges, technical institutes, or university branches. These programs were greatly expanded after 1963, although the cost of these programs was less than that of upper division, graduate, and graduate-professional instruction.

Even with these extensive two-year programs in existence and even with a much larger number of students whose instruction was subsidized by the state, Ohio did experience a substantial increase in appropriations per student in 1967-1969.

Appropriations per student under the recommendations herein would increase from $859 per student to $920 per student in 1969-70. This would be a less dramatic increase than that for 1968-69, but would still be an increase of approximately 8 percent per student in state appropriations. This is a respectable increase.

Ohio has been laboring diligently in recent years to expand and improve its system of public higher education. The task is not completed. Additional appropriations and additional revenues will be needed to carry on the effort in 1969 to 1971. This is no time to falter. The investment in human beings was never more urgent or more promising than today.

APPENDIX

Programmed Expenditures
for
Instructional Activities
by
Level and Field of Study
1969–1971

Lower Division

1,000 Students

Expenditures			
1.	**Departmental Instruction and Research**		
	a. **Faculty Compensation** 42 at $10,500		$ 441,000
	b. **Faculty Support**		119,000
	Personal Services:	$50,000	
	Supplies & Other:	54,000	
	Departmental Admin:	15,000	
2.	**Instructional Services** ($35 per student)		35,000
3.	**Libraries** ($60 per student)		60,000
4.	**Student Services** ($85 per student)		85,000
5.	**General Expense** ($60 per student)		60,000
6.	**Plant Operation** ($110 per student)		110,000
7.	**Administration** ($50 per student)		50,000
			$ 960,000
Income			
1.	**State Subsidy**		450,000
2.	**Other**		510,000
			$ 960,000

Technical Education

1,000 Students

Expenditures

1.	Departmental Instruction and Research		
	a. Faculty Compensation 63 at $10,500		$ 661,500
	b. Faculty Support		168,500
	Personal Services:	$67,500	
	Supplies & Other:	86,000	
	Departmental Admin:	15,000	
2.	Instructional Services ($35 per student)		35,000
3.	Libraries ($50 per student)		50,000
4.	Student Services ($85 per student)		85,000
5.	General Expense ($60 per student)		60,000
6.	Plant Operation ($150 per student)		150,000
7.	Administration ($50 per student)		50,000
			$1,260,000

Income

1.	State Subsidy	750,000
2.	Other	510,000
		$1,260,000

Baccalaureate-Professional and Upper Division

1,000 Students

Expenditures			
1.	Departmental Instruction and Research		
	a. Faculty Compensation		$ 882,000
	63 at $14,000		
	b. Faculty Support		193,000
	Personal Services:	$80,000	
	Supplies & Other:	85,000	
	Departmental Admin:	28,000	
2.	Instructional Services		35,000
	($35 per student)		
3.	Libraries		100,000
	($100 per student)		
4.	Student Services		85,000
	($85 per student)		
5.	General Expense		60,000
	($60 per student)		
6.	Plant Operation		200,000
	($200 per student)		
7.	Administration		50,000
	($50 per student)		$1,605,000
Income			
1.	State Subsidy		1,005,000
2.	Other		600,000
			$1,605,000

Master's and Graduate-Professional

(Law, Dentistry, Pharmacy)

1,000 Students

Expenditures			
1.	Departmental Instruction and Research		
	a. Faculty Compensation		1,411,000
	83 at $17,000		
	b. Faculty Support		559,000
	Personal Services:	$199,000	
	Supplies & Other:	300,000	
	Departmental Admin:	60,000	
2.	Instructional Services ($35 per student)		35,000
3.	Libraries ($200 per student)		200,000
4.	Student Services ($85 per student)		85,000
5.	General Expense ($60 per student)		60,000
6.	Plant Operation ($300 per student)		300,000
7.	Administration ($50 per student)		50,000
			$2,700,000
Income			
1.	State Subsidy		1,800,000
2.	Other		900,000
			$2,700,000

Doctor's Degree

1,000 Students

Expenditures			
1.	**Departmental Instruction and Research**		
	a. **Faculty Compensation**		$2,365,000
	110 at $21,500		
	b. **Faculty Support**		1,105,000
	Personal Services:	$405,000	
	Supplies & Other:	500,000	
	Departmental Admin:	200,000	
2.	**Instructional Services** ($35 per student)		35,000
3.	**Libraries** ($450 per student)		450,000
4.	**Student Services** ($85 per student)		85,000
5.	**General Expense** ($60 per student)		60,000
6.	**Plant Operation** ($500 per student)		500,000
7.	**Administration** ($50 per student)		50,000
			4,650,000
Income			
1.	**State Subsidy**		3,750,000
2.	**Other**		900,000
			$4,650,000

Medical
(Medicine, Veterinary Medicine, Optometry)
1,000 Students

Expenditures

1.	Departmental Instruction and Research		
	a. Faculty Compensation		$3,225,000
	150 at $21,500		
	b. Faculty Support		1,105,000
	Personal Services	$405,000	
	Supplies & Other	500,000	
	Departmental Admin:	200,000	
2.	Instructional Services		225,000
	($225 per student)		
3.	Libraries		450,000
	($450 per student)		
4.	Student Services		85,000
	($85 per student)		
5.	General Expense		60,000
	($60 per student)		
6.	Plant Operation		800,000
	($800 per student)		
7.	Administration		50,000
	($50 per student)		$6,000,000

Income

1.	State Subsidy	5,100,000
2.	Other	900,000
		$6,000,000